DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 947 EA 020 507

TITLE Communicating Change: Working towards Educational Excellence through New and Better School District Communication.

INSTITUTION National School Boards Association, Alexandria, VA.

PUB DATE 88

NOTE 60p.

AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, NSBA, 1680 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314 ($20.00 prepaid).

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Boards of Education; *Change Strategies; Collective Bargaining; *Communication Problems; Decentralization; Decision Making; *Educational Change; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; Public Schools; School Districts; Teacher Education; Unions

ABSTRACT

Members of the National School Boards Association Commission on New Communication in Public School Educational Operations met during the fall of 1987 and winter of 1988 for discussions of the communications issues facing schools and the obstacles to solving them. Out of these talks came a series of broad recommendations on how best to work toward educational excellence through improved communication. The first chapter discusses recommendations for improving teaching as reviewed in several reports: "A Nation at Risk" (1981); "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century" (1986); and "Tomorrow's Teachers" (1986). The second chapter proposes mechanisms for change using union and nonunion mechanisms as well as better communications efforts. The third chapter is a review of selected local and state efforts underway around the country that seem to be producing results. Chapter 4 identifies the "enemies" of change at work in most school districts: high reform costs, shifts of authority, and assessment and adjustment of change. In the final chapter, seven recommendations are aimed at assisting school board members and others with an interest in examining, evaluating, and implementing collaborative partnerships that enhance communications within school districts and improve education operations. Appended are (1) education reform report recommendations; (2) funding sources; and (3) a 138-item bibliography. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301947

Communicating Change:

Working Towards Educational Excellence Through New and Better School District Communication

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Floyd

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NSBA

EA 020 507

NSBA COMMISSION ON NEW COMMUNICATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATIONAL OPERATIONS

JONATHAN T. HOWE, Chairman
Immediate Past President, National School Boards Association

ALLYN AXVIG, Immediate Past President
North Dakota School Boards Association

BOYD BOEHLJE, Immediate Past President
Iowa Association of School Boards

JAMES M. CAMPBELL, President
MISSCO Corporation

ROBERT COULSON, President
American Arbitration Association

SENATOR JAMES DONOVAN, Chairman
New York Senate Education Committee

JUNE GABLER, Immediate Past President
American Association of School Administrators

DOLORES HARDISON, President
National Association of Elementary School Principals

W.D. HILTON, Immediate Past President
Texas Association of School Boards

MARY ANNE HOUX, President
California School Boards Association

SARA JANE KNIGHT, President
Arlington Education Association

JUDITH MURPHY, Immediate Past President
Maine School Boards Association

PAT RICHEY, President
Nebraska State Education Association

LEONARD ROVINS, President
National School Boards Association

ROBERT ST. CLAIR, Immediate Past President
National Association of Secondary School Principals

MANYA UNGAR, President
National Congress of Parents and Teachers

THOMAS A. SHANNON, Executive Director *(ex officio)*
National School Boards Association

Editorial Consultant: William W. Hamilton, Jr.

Communicating Change:

Working Towards Educational Excellence Through New and Better School District Communication

NSBA
LEADERSHIP FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

Copyright © 1988 by National School Boards Association
All rights reserved.

FOREWORD

communication (kə¸myü-nə'kā-shən) n. 1: an act or instance of transmitting 2: information communicated; a verbal or written message 3: a process by which information is exchanged between individuals through a common system of symbols, signs, or behavior 4: a system for communicating 5: a technique for expressing ideas effectively. *(Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary)*

Recent national studies of the quality of education in the United States have called for a substantially more meaningful role for the teacher in deciding what will be taught and how in the schools. Most of the studies have suggested that this goal can be achieved by placing a greater emphasis on school site-based collegial decision-making by teachers and administrators, but none has said with any clarity how best to do it.

Indispensable to the attainment of excellence and equity in the schools is open communication between and among the professionals charged with making it occur and the local school board charged by law with the responsibility and accountability for school district governance. As the definition cited suggests, "communication" can be a single act or a systemic process. The NSBA Commission on New Communication in Public School Educational Operations, created in April 1987, focused on the latter, seeking to:

- Recommend ways to enhance communications on educational issues between and among school boards, administrators and teachers.
- Determine what communications processes can work best—supplementing collective bargaining, where it exists, or as a separate mechanism where there is no bargaining—to develop a positive and cooperative approach to addressing operational issues.
- Demonstrate how these processes can ensure that the desired product—better schools and better-educated children—is forthcoming.
- Assist local school boards in establishing policies designed to encourage these processes in their districts consistent with the school boards' legal responsibility and accountability for school district governance.

Members of the Commission met during the fall of 1987 and winter of 1988 for spirited and thoughtful discussions of the communications issues facing schools and the obstacles to solving them. Out of these talks came a series of broad recommendations for local school districts to consider in determining how best to work towards educational excellence and equity in their communities through improved communications.

We believe that implementation of these recommendations—when tailored to fit the unique circumstances of each school district—will help narrow the distance between national and state calls for education reform and the practical realities of local school operations, while leaving to local communities the final judgment as to what will work for their school systems.

Very truly yours,

Jon Howe

Jonathan T. Howe, Immediate Past President
National School Boards Association
and Chairman, NSBA Commission on
New Communication in Public School
Educational Operations

Tom Shannon

Thomas A. Shannon, Executive Director
National School Boards Association

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Executive Summary	i
	Introduction	v
I.	The Drumbeat for Reform	1
II.	Mechanisms for Change	5
III.	What's Already Happening	9
IV.	School Boards and Change	25
V.	Recommendations for School Districts	28
VI.	Appendix A - Education Reform Report Recommendations	31
VII.	Appendix B - Getting Started: Funding Sources	34
VIII.	Appendix C - Bibliography/Resources	41

A quality workforce has to be productive. This requires better labor-management cooperation. We can no longer afford the luxury of adversarial relations.

Worker participation in various forms, like integrated production teams, has enhanced worker morale and productivity, it has lowered costs, and improved quality. Those firms that have established cooperative relationships are coming on very strong, because everyone involved has a stake in the success of the enterprise.

That kind of momentum is building. There is no better way to motivate someone—to get them to care about the quality of their work—than to give them a say in how things are done, and a stake in the outcome . . . No, we cannot legislate cooperation. But we can encourage . . . cooperation.

Ann McLaughlin
U.S. Secretary of Labor
Remarks at U.S. Department of Labor's
Diamond Jubilee Banquet
March 10, 1988
Washington, D.C.

Executive Summary

COMMUNICATING CHANGE: Working Towards Educational Excellence Through New and Better School District Communications

In its search for ways to enhance public elementary and secondary education excellence, the National School Boards Association Commission on New Communication in Public School Educational Operations has reviewed efforts by school districts to respond to local and national calls for reform. The Commission has identified four broad methods of communication that seem to serve local districts well in developing collegial working arrangements among school boards and professional educators to promote such excellence:

—Advisory Communications;
—Teacher Recognition, Incentive and Professional Development Programs;
—Alternative Negotiating Techniques; and
—Decentralized Decision-making.

The Commission has concluded that school districts benefit from the creation of collaborative partnerships that allow teachers, administrators, parents, taxpayers and students all to feel they have a stake in the outcome of educational efforts.

The Commission developed six recommendations for local districts seeking to enhance their working communications with teachers and other school employees to bring about decentralized decision-making in the schools:

- School boards should encourage new communications efforts as part of their thrust to improve local education.
- School boards should mobilize public interest and support for efforts to broaden participation in decision-making processes.
- School boards should build communications mechanisms district-wide and within each school that allow flexibility in decision-making.
- School boards should accept and implement the concept that the best decisions are likely to result when those who will implement the decisions participate in the decision-making process. Final decisions must be consistent with applicable laws, regulations and board policies.
- School boards should initiate discussions with teachers and administrators about their greater involvement in decision-making. The approach will vary depending upon whether the school district is in a collective bargaining situation or not. But the overall focus will be similar: involving administrators, teachers and teacher groups closely in the formulation of educational policy.
- School boards should build trust and communicate confidence in the schools and approach change in a positive manner.

The Commission reviewed several recent national educational reports which call for a sweeping array of changes in the professional status and authority of teachers. It noted that the national solutions were adaptable in many instances, but that the reports gave little guidance to local school boards as to how best to tackle the problems addressed. Many districts

have been creative in pursuing educational improvements over the past decade or more, some of them well ahead of the calls for reform and decentralization. As a result, the Commission pointed out that national pronouncements about the "crisis" in American education may seem remote to school board members and administrators who see their local schools, while still needing improvement, as responsive and effective.

The Commission noted, however, that all school districts should continue to heed the national education reform movement's calls for the development of new and better vehicles for sharing information and responsibility within the school system. It said cooperation from school professionals and their unions is essential to successful communications. The Commission found that while most public school systems participate in collective bargaining with their teacher organizations, the adversarial nature of these discussions has worked against cooperation and candor in some instances.

In districts with bargaining and those without, the four broad means of communications previously identified are being used to achieve a better dialogue among school boards, administrators and teachers.

In an *advisory communications* framework, education professionals are asked to devise proposals for further consideration and approval. Decision-making remains with the board and administration. In both districts with collective bargaining, and those where it is absent, advisory communications programs require a lot of talking by teachers and principals and a lot of listening by superintendents, central office officials and school board members. The results can be satisfying if the parties are committed to listening and collaborating. Administrators must be willing to invest time and genuine interest in the process. Teachers and teacher groups must be willing to participate and show faith in the goodwill of those who must finally make decisions.

Teacher recognition, incentive and professional development programs also are devices for enhancing communications within the school district. In many districts, outstanding teachers are rewarded for their achievement and sometimes asked to assume additional responsibility (for additional remuneration) in evaluating other teachers, training and monitoring new employees, and writing curriculum.

Although they often overlap, there is an intended distinction between recognition and professional development and incentive programs. Recognition generally involves a self-contained event—an award dinner, a ceremony, or a one-time bonus for a job well done. The impact is necessarily limited in most instances. Professional development programs, on the other hand, involve teachers being asked to assume added responsibilities and given access to training and advancement because of excellent performance. Usually there are accompanying financial incentives.

Alternative negotiating techniques in which the two sides sit as one team and search for mutually acceptable solutions are utilized in districts where the collective bargaining process has not operated effectively. Examples of this are "Win Win" and "Collective Gaining." Alternative discussion methods developed primarily for these purposes and centering on economic issues left over from labor-management negotiations are now being adapted in some districts in an effort to improve the quality of local education.

Decentralized decision-making often takes place through mechanisms jointly developed that are compatible with overall board policy and, where

... school districts benefit from the creation of collaborative partnerships that allow teachers, administrators, parents, taxpayers and students all to feel they have a stake in the outcome of educational efforts.

collective bargaining exists, also function parallel to the collective bargaining agreement. Decentralizing decision-making is recommended by most of the major national reform reports. But, the reports have been silent on the exact form of such decentralization and the process through which it can be achieved.

Decentralized decision-making may be limited to specific areas of education policy and operations or extended broadly to all aspects. It can range from delegating to principals and teachers decision-making authority around textbook selection and curriculum design, to actually giving principals and teachers expanded site management responsibility under general board policy for school budgets, schedules, discipline and most other matters affecting school site operation.

Many districts have been creative in pursuing educational improvements over the past decade or more, some of them well ahead of the calls for reform and decentralization.

Decentralized decision-making can be developed in districts that participate in collective bargaining as well as in districts that do not. It can flow out of the bargaining process itself, or through other communications.

The Commission identified a wide range of communications activities already in place in school districts and suggested that they be used as examples and reviewed for adaptation by other districts, where appropriate. The Commission expressed confidence in the ability of local school boards and school districts to meet effectively the challenge of improving communications in public school educational operations. ■

THE CALLS FOR REFORM: A BRIEF REVIEW

As part of its study leading to the report on new and better school district communications, members of the NSBA Commission reviewed five significant national reports urging changes in the nation's schools. The highlights of those reports are briefly summarized here.

1. A NATION AT RISK, issued in 1983 by the Secretary of Education's National Commission on Excellence in Education, sought "to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways. . . ." Among the recommendations were several specifically aimed at improving teaching.

- Colleges and school districts should work to raise the competence level of teachers.
- Districts should increase teacher salaries and make them market sensitive and performance-based.
- Career ladders in local schools should distinguish between beginning instructors, experienced teachers and "master teachers" and reward them accordingly.
- Nonschool personnel should be brought in as an immediate response to teacher shortages, drawing qualified individuals from the community with appropriate educational backgrounds. The report singled out the shortage in trained math and science teachers as an example where recent graduates, graduate students and retired scientists and math-trained individuals could help.
- Financial incentives should be developed to attract top college students into teaching careers.
- Experienced teachers should be involved in designing teacher training and in supervision.

The report called for greater citizen involvement, said principals and superintendents should convince the community of the need to support school reform, and urged school boards to offer professional development and other support for teachers.

2. A NATION PREPARED: TEACHERS FOR THE 21st CENTURY was released in 1986 by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. It calls for rebuilding the U.S. educational system to meet economic challenges ahead. The report makes these recommendations, among others:

- Restructure schools to provide a professional teaching environment, allowing teachers to decide how best to meet goals set by school boards and the state, and holding teachers accountable for student progress. Link incentives for teachers to schoolwide performance.
- Introduce Lead Teachers into a restructured teaching force that allows skilled and experienced teachers to play a role in school management and in training and monitoring their colleagues.
- Make teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive.

3. TIME FOR RESULTS, the 1986 report on education goals for 1991 by the National Governors' Association, set up task forces and challenged school boards to improve their standards. It urged states to deregulate districts that show progress but to take over school districts deemed failing. The task force on teaching called upon governors to, among other things:

- Create state initiatives to provide a professional work environment for teachers and obtain from teachers a commitment to high performance.
- Develop opportunities for teachers, principals, administrators, school board members and the public to be heard more clearly on school issues.
- Reward outstanding teaching.
- Increase school spending and upgrade teacher compensation.

4. TOMORROW'S TEACHERS, produced by the Holmes Group of teacher college deans and educators in 1986, was a self-examination of teacher preparation programs. The report urged:

- Making schools better places for motivated teachers to work and learn.
- Developing new models of shared authority among teachers and administrators in the schools.
- Recognizing differences in the skills, experience and commitment of teachers and creating a three-level teacher professional structure with more autonomy given to those best qualified and experienced.

5. VENTURES IN GOOD SCHOOLING, produced jointly by the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1986 for local building-level use, provides indicators for measuring the collegial quality of teacher-principal relationships, lists practices common in effective schools and encourages school staff to use the information to assess each school's situation.

INTRODUCTION

A tidal wave of reports analyzing, criticizing and calling for the wholesale renovation of American public education has washed across the country in recent years, each suggesting a "crisis" with even greater urgency than its predecessor. A casual reader of daily newspapers regularly learns that yet another well-respected study group has reported on the challenges facing our education system. Whatever their long-term impact, the reports have helped stimulate an important new national debate about education in the United States.

The reports advocate sweeping changes in the way teachers are hired, evaluated and compensated, the roles they play in the classroom, their professional preparation, relationships with administrators and their fellow teachers and with the way teaching occurs. They sound common themes: a teaching profession facing substantial turnover but shunned by top college graduates who seek more professional satisfaction and financial reward than they associate with public education today; teachers burdened by cumbersome bureaucracies and administrative distractions; and students failing to achieve their full potential.

The reports call for "restructuring" the schools, advancing the teaching profession and providing teachers and principals with more resources to achieve their missions. In each there is a common omission: a failure to consider the dynamics of implementing the recommendations in a real-world context of school district employer-employee relations and financial constraints.

While the reports are national in scope, the American system of public education is a very local enterprise. It begins with citizen school board members elected by their neighbors or appointed by political leaders to set policies and guide the direction of education in a given community. It then extends to the staff professionals who translate those policies into goals and timetables for school principals overseeing the fundamental local unit of education: the teacher, based in a classroom, surrounded by children.

If the recommendations of the various reports are to live in practice and not just in theory, their rhetoric must translate into action within each local community. To achieve this there must be processes and techniques of communication between and among school board members, administrators and teachers that nurture a free and unfettered dialogue about improvement within the system.

If the recommendations of the various reports are to live in practice and not just in theory, their rhetoric must translate into action within each local community. To achieve this there must be processes and techniques of communication between and among school board members, administrators and teachers that nurture a free and unfettered dialogue about improvement within the system. In addition, there must be a commitment to similar communication between and among educators, parents, students, taxpayers and leaders of business and industry in each community. This external communications exercise with those outside the professional educational community should lead to a blending of ideals, ideas and concerns that becomes the critical consensus for success.

The calls for "teacher empowerment" that flow through the various reform initiatives add up to moving decision-making and accountability closer to the community and school site level, away from state and federal control. It's simply an extension of the traditional philosophy that in education, local control is likely to provide more flexibility and better understanding of community needs. Strengthening site-based decision-making within a pattern of district-wide policies is a logical outgrowth of that kind of thinking—flowing out of the historic preference in this country for local school governance.

Why Another Commission Report?

The National School Boards Association created the Commission on New Communication in Public School Educational Operations in part as a response to the growing movement for change in the schools articulated in national studies and calls for reform. Primarily, however, NSBA wanted to look for ways to encourage better consultation among school boards, administrators and teachers and a sharing of ideas for enriching the public schools. It charged the Commission—independent of association governance and made up of school board members, administrators, experts, principals, teachers and parents—with reviewing the studies, looking at examples of innovative programs already in place and providing guidance to school board members and others concerned with local public education on how best to reach those constituencies critical to building good schools.

An immediate issue to be considered was collective bargaining. About two-thirds of all public school teachers in the United States are organized into formal bargaining units—generally represented by affiliates of the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). Of the more than 15,000 public school systems in the United States responsible for educating nearly 40 million school children, most engage in some form of bilateral negotiations or meet-and-confer arrangements around economic and professional concerns. The scope and formality varies greatly from state to state and within a state. Today 34 states plus the District of Columbia have laws requiring collective bargaining by school districts with teachers and employees.

In districts in those states, collective bargaining structures sometimes offer an in-place communications mechanism adaptable for discussions on new ways of doing things. The Commission noted that some approaches to educational excellence have evolved from the bargaining process. Nevertheless, distrust often complicates relationships between teacher organizations and school districts, so that supplemental mechanisms may be helpful in ensuring a useful dialogue. In those districts where teachers are not covered by collective bargaining, school boards may have greater freedom to introduce new structures and try innovative ideas, but successful communication will always depend heavily upon the good will, trust and commitment to experimentation from all participants—teachers, principals, administrators and parents. The Commission intends this report to be helpful to all school districts attempting to respond to calls for change.

Communications is a Key to School Improvement

One thing flows out of all the critical reports on education: new mechanisms must be found (or old ones improved) that encourage teachers, administrators and school boards to talk to one another—and to listen with greater skill. In a public school system, as in the public sector generally, information is a key ingredient for building responsive and locally appropriate management. Investing the time and energy required to build an environment for better understanding and fostering collaboration in the schools will be profitable to everyone involved in the basic mission of every school system—producing well-educated children and satisfied parents.

Local school boards must be the pacesetters in this process. They set the policies that guide the principals and teachers responsible for the education of 40 million children throughout the country. The Commission does not believe a school "crisis" exists everywhere, nor that problems exist uniformly with solutions applicable on a national scale. The challenges confronting those who oversee rural or suburban districts may be as complex as, but quite different from, the issues facing school officials in an industrial city. Indeed, the Commission found evidence that many districts—rural, suburban and urban—are well ahead of the reform curve, moving forward with innovations that fit the unique needs of their areas.

Two recurring themes appear in the calls for reform and much of the writing by authorities in the field: "restructuring schools" and "empowerment of teachers." The Commission takes "restructuring" to mean, simply, removing barriers to improvement and understanding in the schools. "Empowerment" means bringing teachers more completely into the day-to-day school district operational picture—sharing information in a collegial way with those in the system charged with direct ongoing contact with children in the classroom, designing instructional programs in close cooperation with them and assigning to them a share of responsibility for fostering excellence in the schools. These rather shapeless concepts can take on meaning only against a specific state or local school district backdrop.

A word, finally, about those who draw rigid parallels between management systems in private enterprise and the schools, and who believe that merely by adapting corporate principles communities can have rapid improvement in school system management. There is much to be learned from the marketplace, where a quality product leads to profits. But in the schools, the "product" is the profit: well-educated, responsible youngsters able to go out into the community and assume their roles as tomorrow's citizens, their individual capacities developed by a public school education. The "management" of public schools requires a blending of hard-headed methods with an ideology that says there is no job more important for our country and

the world than keeping local schools effective.

The president of the Kellogg Foundation wrote recently: "The changing environment of public education has placed an unparalleled burden on the leadership in our nation's schools. At a time when excessive demands are being placed on available fiscal and human resources, effective board leadership is vital to cope with these new challenges."

This Commission believes our nation's school boards—with support from administrators, teachers, parents and the broader community—can handle the job. ■

CHAPTER I
THE DRUMBEAT FOR REFORM

Each generation of Americans has outstripped its parents in education, in literacy and in economic attainment. For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, those of their parents.

—Paul Copperman
cited in ***A Nation At Risk***

Five years have passed since the National Commission on Excellence in Education produced its seminal report on the state of America's schools, and the outgrowth has been a considerable effort by the states and by local school boards to examine and adjust policies and priorities. Probably no report on education in this century has so stirred those responsible for education in the United States.

Created by Education Secretary T. H. Bell in the summer of 1981, the Commission held public hearings, commissioned expert papers, looked at notable programs and deliberated for 18 months before issuing *A Nation at Risk*, seeking (in the Commission's words) "to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality throughout the length and breadth of our land."

It found that the content of secondary school curricula had been watered down and that many students moved through the system without enough exposure to core subjects. Its report said that the professional worklife and rewards for teachers were not attractive to promising and academically able college students, so that teachers were being drawn from the low ends of graduation lists.

The report made seven recommendations for improving teaching:

- Raise the competence level of teachers.
- Increase salaries and make them market sensitive and performance-based.
- Implement 11-month teacher contracts.
- Develop career ladders that distinguish among beginning instructors, experienced teachers and "master teachers."
- Involve personnel from outside the system to remedy teacher shortages, especially in math and science.
- Create financial incentives to attract top students into teaching.
- Involve experienced teachers in designing teacher preparation programs and in teacher supervision.

The Commission called for greater citizen involvement and fiscal support. It said principals and superintendents should build community support for reform, and that school boards must offer professional development and other support for teachers. It said state and local school officials should share responsibility for financing and governing the schools and bringing on the recommended reforms.

The Second Wave

In 1986, a second wave of reform reports washed across the country, with two standing out among them. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* called for an overhaul of the teaching profession in the United States to strengthen the country's ability to compete in the world market. The product of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, the report heralded two essential truths: that educational standards must be more demanding and that the key is in equipping well-educated teachers with the power and resources to get the job done.

The second major report, issued in August 1986, was called *Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education.* Task forces of the National Governors' Association (NGA) considered questions confronting American schools and attempted to set up mechanisms for measuring change in the quality of public education over a five-year period.

The governors challenged local school boards to improve their standards and said states should be willing to deregulate schools that show positive change, but also be willing to take over and reorganize "bankrupt" districts deemed to be failing.

A third report in 1986, *Tomorrow's Teachers*, by the Holmes Group of college deans of education, set out to review teacher education. It called for establishing a three-tier system of teacher licensing: an untenured "instructor" license for entry-level personnel, temporary and nonrenewable, and two tenured certifications—"professional teacher" and "career professional."

All or most of the studies called upon school officials to:

- Restructure schools to provide a professional teaching environment, allowing teachers and site administrators to decide how best to meet state and local goals for children while holding them accountable for student progress.
- Develop a career ladder that allows teachers of proven skill to take the lead in the redesign and management of schools and in helping their colleagues meet high standards.
- Require a B.A. degree as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching, and create a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education, based on systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in the schools.
- Build a national resolve for attracting strongly qualified minority graduates into teaching careers.
- Relate incentives for teachers to student performance on a schoolwide basis, and provide schools with the materials and staff that are essential to productivity.
- Make teachers' salaries and career rewards competitive with other professions.

All of the reports agreed that funding was important, but that it was only one ingredient among others, such as community support and collegial school relationships, important in improving the condition of teaching and learning. More important, the reports suggest, is collaboration, both within education and among members of the school community, to create changed and improved schools. In advocating that teaching become a true profession, the reports propose giving teachers additional authority tempered by peer evaluation.

Although the governors waved a stick of threatened intervention in local schools, they also offered a carrot of deregulation for effective districts. The other reports agreed that further regulation was not desirable. Rather, they urged policymakers to adopt policies that stimulate innovation and risk-taking in instruction.

Ventures in Good Schooling, subtitled "A Cooperative Model for a Successful Secondary School," was produced in 1986 by the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals for use at the campus level. Its purpose is to enable teachers and principals to analyze their own relationships and practices and to find ways to pursue shared goals for quality education. It offers specific indicators for measuring the collegial quality of teacher-principal relationships in approaching goal-setting for the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relationships. It lists practices common in effective schools and encourages a school staff to use the information to assess its own situation.

The slender booklet and its accompanying handbook, *What is Ventures in Good Schooling?*, presume that these site-level activities take place in the context of a bilateral relationship between the local associations, on behalf of teachers and principals, and representatives of the school district. Nevertheless, the measurements in the report's cooperative model for a successful school can be applied to school districts in which there is no collective bargaining.

A National Focus on Education

The dramatic repetition of the reports and their focus on the "crisis" in the schools served one overarching useful purpose: it put education back on the table as a critical element in the nation's political debate. There's no overstating the importance of that development.

But broad generalities about the need for wholesale reform and vast changes can seem very remote to the local school board member trying to sort through his or her community's priorities and problems. Teachers' union President Albert Shanker noted, in an article published about the time of the Carnegie report, that most of the calls for reform "were compromised by a central flaw: they told us where to go but not how to get there."

Educational excellence is not exactly a new idea, but the reports stimulated a lot of new thinking. The first wave led many states and localities to raise standards and make some other improvements system-wide. The second wave focused primarily on changes

needed at the school level and in the classroom. They urged school boards and educators to develop policies that allow innovation and experimentation to flourish and to foster site-based decision-making. Central to the recommendations is the concept of the professional teacher, better trained, liberated from administrative chores that steal time from instructional activities and surrounded by other teachers and administrators who encourage thoughtful and creative new approaches to the learning process.

It seems to serve districts well to create collaborative partnerships to ensure that teachers, administrators, school district leaders, parents and other taxpayers and students all feel they have a stake in the outcome of educational reform. Creating a community consensus around ways to improve schools is a desirable goal, but getting there without a road map can be difficult. The reports stress the need to change attitudes and procedures toward education, as well as relationships within and outside the education community, but offer no detailed guidelines. The NSBA Commission has limited its focus to the need for improved *internal* communications in school districts, but acknowledges that districts also will benefit from throwing out a wide net within the community at large, seeking agreement around shared goals of school excellence. The Commission did not address funding issues.

Collective Bargaining and Reform

A recent collective bargaining settlement between the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) and the Rochester, NY, school district is cited by many for its concrete steps toward reform and instilling greater teacher authority. "By almost any measure, the new contract . . . is a model of labor-management cooperation," said *The Washington Post*. "What is going on in Rochester has to be among the most interesting and important events in American education today," the president of the National Center on Education and the Economy told *The New York Times*. But the price tag—salaries of up to $70,000 a year for senior teachers by 1989—will make many taxpayers gasp.

The Rochester agreement evolving from collective bargaining is very much in line with the Carnegie recommendations. The agreement provides for four categories of classroom teachers: interns (fresh out of school who work with senior teachers or mentors); resident instructors; certified professional teachers; and lead teachers (senior classroom teachers who assume mentor or training responsibilities and share in administration). It provides teachers unprecedented flexibility in the way they do their work and promotes campus-based collaboration with other teachers and administrators.

Historically, collective bargaining between school districts and school employees has not focused on educational excellence. Collective bargaining has followed the private sector industrial model and focused primarily on wages, hours, benefits and other personnel issues. School boards have been understandably reluctant to share authority over such things as curriculum development in response to bargaining demands, and unions often have been ready to trade away instructional concerns and stand firmest on meat-and-potatoes issues like salaries, job security and length of the work day.

In the last few years, however, both national teachers organizations—the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO) and the National Education Association—have devoted attention and resources to addressing with their members and the public the serious educational issues facing the nation's schools and covered in the national reports. Both national organizations have proclaimed a commitment to enhancing the quality of public education in the United States and have become major participants in the debate.

Not surprisingly, the teachers' organizations have seen the debate over educational reform as an opportunity to broaden the scope of collective bargaining. The national push for reform has led to the formation of joint committees or other mechanisms that enable teachers, administrators and school district leaders to regularly discuss goals and methods for the schools. Sometimes, however, the tense histories of the bargaining process have left scars that make union-management linkages unlikely vehicles for thoughtful discussions around proposals for educational reform.

It is neither the purpose of this Commission nor the policy of the National School Boards Association to encourage or discourage unionism and collective bargaining. That is an issue for local school boards to consider, consistent with the laws of their states and the wishes of their teachers, citizenry and themselves.

But it is clear that meeting the challenge of reform calls for new and better communications within the educational community, nationally and locally. Reading through and digesting each report, considering what is applicable to one's community and what is not and determining how best to set the appropriate processes of change in motion will require an unbiased process of communication among the affected parties.

Communicating Involves Listening

For school board members, that means talking—and listening—to teachers, administrators, state education officials and legislators, parents, business people and other taxpayers about what

they think is needed and how it can be done. Each of those interests is important to making change work as well as building and maintaining local confidence in the schools. Each party should come to want to be part of that dialogue.

In every form of communication there are at least three elements that are important to the success or failure of the effort. Careful planning is critical in order to minimize disruption and reduce the potential for misunderstanding, unrealistic expectations and anxiety. As management often dreads losing authority, other staff may also be insecure about possible changes.

Second, training is almost always helpful. Skills-building can move a committee away from the "them" and "us" stance of traditional labor-management confrontations and toward mutual approaches to problem-solving. The use of outside facilitators is one way to move the process along. Development activities like these can assist in reaching a desired outcome, and also strengthen confidence among all participants.

Finally, information-sharing is crucial. If one party is deemed to be withholding information from the others, it can be fatal to the process. Thus, those concerned should be informed about any contemplated program changes well in advance of implementation, and there should be structured efforts to evaluate the change. Communication must be a multi-faceted process, horizontal and vertical.

Ironically, the national reports which call for dramatic changes in the way our schools do business are, for all of their thoughtfulness, the ultimate "from-the-top-down" approach to educational reform. It is the Commission's hope that creating new and better mechanisms for communications around and about our local public schools will result in ideas leading to educational betterment, bubbling up from those best positioned to make change happen. ■

CHAPTER II
MECHANISMS FOR CHANGE

Though the plan we recommend is complex, the goal is clear: a system in which school districts can offer the pay, autonomy and career opportunities necessary to attract to teaching highly qualified people who would otherwise take up other professional careers. In return, teachers would agree to higher standards for teachers and real accountability for student performance. This framework implies a transformation of the environment for teaching. . . .

—A Nation Prepared:
Teachers for the 21st Century

The recent national studies proposing new ways of doing things in America's schools have been quite broad in their assessments both of the problems we face and of the solutions that lie ahead. The 1986 Carnegie Forum on Education report, more clearly than the others, laid out a vision of what it felt was needed to bring about the desired results.

Acknowledging that taxpayers and society have a general stake in the success of improved schools, the Carnegie Forum made it clear that the nitty-gritty process of making change happen has to be initiated by local policymakers—school boards—and actively involve teachers, their representative organizations, administrators and board members. "Involving teachers means working through their representatives, the unions," the report said. "The confrontational stance that frequently characterizes the relationship between school boards and unions could doom these recommendations."

The report pointed to some school districts that have already moved forward in a positive way toward implementing some of its recommendations and noted that they tended to follow naturally from new accommodation based on providing teachers professional-level salaries and a professional environment in exchange for the acceptance of professional standards of excellence and the willingness to be held accountable for the product of one's work. Teachers should be involved in the design of these new arrangements, through unions, where collective bargaining exists, or some other equitable communications structure, where collective bargaining is absent.

Union and Nonunion Mechanisms

Using the vehicle best suited to a given school district, school policymakers should find ways to appraise the reform recommendations and adopt those that seem most appropriate through a collegial structure that is inclusive at every level. These communications models can evolve out of existing collective bargaining relationships, but could just as easily be created in a nonbargaining environment. Many varied forms of labor-management or lateral employer-employee relationships already exist in the private and public sectors and can be used as models.

In the private sector, scores of programs have been implemented by large corporations—union and nonunion—to enable workers and managers to thrash out together the day-to-day problems on the shop floor. These go by many names, among them labor-management committees, workers' circles, productivity councils and quality control conferences. They are all built around the notion that the people closest to the product are likely to be the best informed about it and know how best to produce it efficiently and in a way in which they, the employees, derive satisfaction.

The ultimate measurement of success in the private sector is, of course, profits. Others are work force stability, investor confidence, customer satisfaction, and community standing.

In schools, the product is learning, packaged in well-rounded, educated young men and women who graduate and assume productive roles in society. The "product" is influenced by so many external factors that even

in the best school environments it is often hard to gauge with any certainty what works best. However, there are certainly a number of desirable outcomes for school administrators to look and hope for: increased school attendance, heightened and constructive parental involvement, rising test scores, reduced teacher absence and turnover and fewer grievances and work stoppages, equitable distribution of resources, reduced drop-out rates, higher college enrollments and ready movement of graduates into the work place. For both teachers and principals, desirable results may include increased public support, fewer strikes, greater professional development, more enthusiastic parental involvement, increased volunteerism, stronger parent-teacher organizations and harmonious relationships with the school board.

School board members look for these benchmarks, too, but their unique yardstick is by and large political: Are parents and students satisfied that they are getting quality education? Are the taxpayers footing the bill without revolting? Can the school board obtain increased legislative support, or at least less intervention? Are employers able to fit graduates into jobs that offer promise and prosperity, and colleges accept graduates into strong academic programs without remedial education?

Moving Ahead of the Waves

The reform movement stirred many local and state school leaders to critically examine their ways of doing things, but long before the first report there were many school boards determining without external impetus that better communications efforts were needed to find ways to improve teaching. As seen in the next chapter, many efforts to broaden the involvement of teachers and administrators in planning and management have flowed out of adversarial bargaining or related tension, with both sides striving to establish better dialogues. Others have been created in response to criticism of local schools or to correct a serious deficiency. Some local committees are the products of state-directed mandates to decentralize or other external pushes for reform.

The shape and origin of the committees differ, and so does their scope of activities. Many committees, councils and ad hoc bodies have been formed for a single purpose, e.g., to restructure the athletic program to correct inequities between activities traditionally fashioned for boys and girls. Others are ongoing panels created to advise the superintendent and board on a regular, fairly formal basis about an issue or set of issues. In each instance, the desired result is to give everyone who is likely to want involvement an opportunity to be involved.

Some of these panels result from collective bargaining, and serve to supplement the contractual agreement between the union and the school board by working out real-life problems that the contract doesn't specifically address. Others substitute for or even help fend off bargaining, by providing alternative channels for teachers and other school employees to make their views known and to participate in defining change.

Each of these mechanisms faces several fairly common obstacles. Teachers can be skeptical and even hostile, particularly if the relationship with the school administration has been antagonistic and controversial. Administrators can be a problem, too, fearing that opening up discussion and broadening the decision-making process will erode their status and result in a loss of control. In localities where there are competing teachers' organizations, the rivalry for membership can politicize everything, including informal communications efforts.

Nevertheless, many cooperative communications activities are being initiated in the schools, focusing on curriculum development, teacher recruitment, peer evaluation and a wide range of other issues. Quality of work-life circles are growing in the public schools as well, focusing on everything from health insurance needs to student safety.

Four broad methodologies seem to emerge from a review of communications activities already underway in school districts around the country:

- Advisory efforts, in which school officials are making a considerably greater effort to consult and listen to teachers, principals and others before making decisions.
- Teacher recognition and professional development, in which outstanding performance is given more notice, programs are developed and adapted and peer mechanisms are used to determine and respond to development needs.
- Rebuilding efforts, in which parties to unhappy bargaining episodes look for alternative strategies to build a climate more hospitable to cooperation.
- Decentralized decision-making, in which authority is shared and choices are made by collegial bodies representing teachers and administrators.

There's nothing sacrosanct about any of these categories, and certainly many districts borrow from more than one to get their daily work done. The idea is to find a mechanism that allows for the sharing of information in a continuous and useful way and that brings about problem-solving.

Advisory Communications

Advisory communications for teachers is just what it seems to be: teachers are asked to advise decisionmakers as to how best to conquer a problem.

Sometimes the advice is heeded, sometimes it is modified and sometimes it is ignored. Management must be willing to invest time and genuine interest in the process and earn the trust and goodwill of the teachers and staff who must ultimately implement the decisions.

Advisory communications require a lot of talking by the teachers and principals and a lot of listening by superintendents and central office officials. The results can be dazzling and satisfying—if the parties work to make it that way. Prior to the advent of collective bargaining in the schools, advisory communications through faculty committees and representative councils were the norm for dealing with most classroom issues. Even within a district governed by a collective bargaining agreement, however, advisory communications between site-based personnel and administrators can result in innovation and excellent understandings.

In Texas, collective bargaining is prohibited by law. Teachers have, nevertheless, been involved in planning education reforms at the state level through service on special advisory committees and task forces. They also commonly work on standing advisory committees within their schools and school districts. Teachers have served on advisory groups to develop the state teacher appraisal system, set the performance standards state-wide for career ladder assignment, establish roles and requirements for master teachers, conduct reviews of local curriculum programs and set professional standards for teachers.

Another state without collective bargaining, South Carolina, has been working successfully with Implementation Councils at the school, district and regional levels as a way of translating state-wide calls for education improvements and addressing teacher concerns. Regional council meetings are attended by district representatives, who may include superintendents, teachers and local school board members. The Implementation Councils serve to make known needs and concerns which then are forwarded to state-level committees for action.

Teacher Recognition and Professional Development

Although they often overlap, there is an intended distinction between teacher recognition and professional development and incentive programs. Recognition is a one-time event—an award dinner, a ceremony, a bonus for a job well done. Professional development programs involve the taking on of added responsibilities and training opportunities because of excellent prior performance, usually with financial incentives or rewards.

Some forms of teacher recognition and professional development programs have been around forever, beginning with uncomplicated "Teacher of the Year" ceremonies designed to reward and publicize excellence in performance. More recently, school districts are rewarding excellence and seniority with new job designations, such as "mentors" and "lead teachers," and with extra compensation and authority.

The Toledo, OH, Intern Intervention Program begun in 1981 serves as one sophisticated example of how teacher incentives and professional development, in this instance achieved through bilateral negotiations with a union, give teachers a considerably freer hand to identify problems and devise corrective programs, assist in training and rehabilitating staff who need it and even in disciplining or terminating teachers who fail to obtain peer approval.

Schools in the nation's capital, Washington, D.C., in the state of California and elsewhere have begun making wide use of "mentor teachers," chosen by principals and teachers together on the basis of peer recognition of their teaching skills. Relieved of regular classroom assignments, they work with teachers in several schools on problems and assist in the training and orientation of new faculty members.

Alternative Negotiating Techniques

Some of the best ideas for enhancing communications within the schools are found in the ashes of failure. Looking for ways to heal the wounds after a strike or combative negotiations has led many districts to try innovative and sometimes remarkably successful new approaches to team-building.

Alternative discussion methods developed primarily for addressing issues left over from labor-management negotiations are now being adapted to efforts to enhance the overall quality of local education. The methods vary widely in shape and nomenclature. Some carry the names of the consultants or administrators who constructed them. Others have upbeat names that stress their positive intentions, like "Win/Win" or "Collective Gaining." Still others are just small-scale, local efforts to get all the parties into the same room thinking in the same direction.

These processes may be applied to fleshing out a contract, or to establishing task forces to address instructional issues. Typically, teachers and school officials sit on the same side of the table and try to identify common approaches to problems without bringing their adversarial baggage into the room. When it works best, the product is easy for all sides to embrace. Often a third party enters in and keeps all the players focusing on the problem at hand.

Decentralized Decision-making

Decentralized decision-making may be limited to a single aspect of education policy and operation such as curriculum development, or it may extend broadly to all aspects including finances and community relations. The common feature is the shifting of control down the ladder to school administrators and, especially, to teachers, allowing them the professional authority and freedom to make decisions about what to teach, how to teach and how to evaluate their students.

Site-based authority shared by principals and teachers can take many forms. Increasingly, individual schools are being given an operating budget and allowed to determine—within board-set policies and the law—what the staffing patterns, the schedules, the grading system and the day-to-day teaching program will be. In a sense, decentralized decision-making is the oldest form of administration around—harking back to the time when the schoolmaster was king in his school—but with a new, collaborative twist. In today's decentralization, teachers, students and parents are being brought into the picture. It's occurring through collective bargaining in places like Rochester and Miami, and without collective bargaining in districts like Richardson, TX, a Dallas suburb.

In some situations these devices are compatible with the communications systems already in place, while in others a major restructuring will be needed. In each instance, it is crucial to emphasize collegiality and compatibility and try to avoid polarization.

None of these communications mechanisms is perfect, and none can guarantee that teachers will be happy, principals reinforced, school board members re-elected, bond issues passed and children well educated. Nor are they neat and separate in their forms. The point of it all is to share information in a continuous and useful way, and to develop a problem-solving style that is right for a given community. For any method to be successful, there must be a realistic understanding that overall policy-making authority has to remain with those elected or appointed to carry that responsibility—local school boards. ■

Effective leadership is not the sole responsibility of the principal. Leadership should result from organizing a school's staff and material resources in an open, interdependent working environment that values teachers as participants in decisions. What is needed is a new way to organize schools for systematic improvement.

—Time For Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education

CHAPTER III

WHAT'S ALREADY HAPPENING: A review of works in progress

The recent reports pointing toward new professionalism and change in the way the schools are structured are recommended reading for school board members, administrators and anyone else concerned about the advancement of public education in the United States. But none of them offers many clues to school boards as to how best to implement the sweeping reforms that each recommends.

Had they attempted to address that challenge, with all its implications for governance, revenue and spending and personnel policies, the governors, for example, might not have completed their report before 1991. Instead, it has been left to local school officials to analyze these broad philosophical directives and decide how and whether to apply them to the real world of the local school system.

Broad statements about power shifts and restructuring take on flesh only against a specific state or school district backdrop. Long before the reform movement bloomed at the national level, a great deal of creative thinking had taken root in local school districts. More communities each day are coming to grips with the issues outlined in the reports and other issues significant in their communities. School districts and state governments are responding, increasingly focusing on the school as an entity and greater autonomy at the school level as an important approach to better teaching and better learning.

The proposals covered in three recent policy reports—*Tomorrow's Teachers*, by the Holmes Group, *A Nation Prepared*, by the Carnegie Task Force, and *Time for Results*, the NGA document, fall into eight general areas: organization of the schools, organization of the teaching profession, teacher compensation, teacher incentives and student performance, professional standards for teachers, teacher education, teacher recruitment and (in the NGA report) state regulation.

The overlap or centerpiece is professionalizing teaching—treating teachers in a way that acknowledges the special expertise and judgment they bring into the classroom and encouraging collegial interaction with other teachers and school professionals around common, mutually arrived-at goals. Efforts to improve communications and to reorganize are directed at giving teachers a greater voice in what the schools set out to do, and providing them a meaningful role in the various decision-making processes.

The focal point of this Commission's report is communications—the way that school officials pass on and receive information and materials, relationships with administrators and teachers and the structures they use to ensure that ideas and information flow efficiently in all directions. There is substantial overlap between communications that center on instructional issues such as teacher professionalization, and those that involve wages, hours, grievance procedures and conditions of employment. The Commission hopes to assist local school districts in finding mechanisms that can address all these subjects equitably, but the emphasis is on communicating toward academic improvement.

In Chapter Two, the Commission listed the four broad models being used by local districts for communicating with

teachers and other school interests: improved communications and advisory mechanisms, through which superintendents and other managers systematically consult teachers and principals but retain most of the day-to-day decision authority; teacher recognition and professional development devices, which look primarily to building teacher excellence and rewarding it while also seeking to reinforce teacher strengths (and weed out weaknesses) through evaluation and training; alternative negotiating techniques employed to heal wounds and build trust, which can be adapted for ongoing communication around instructional issues; and decentralized decision-making, in which teachers and principals together are given substantial sign-off responsibility for activities in their schools and held accountable for the results.

What follow are works in progress—selected local and state efforts under way around the country that seem to be producing results. Some have been around for a long time. Others are in direct response to the reform movement, or to more localized versions of the same thing. A few have quantified their results; others are still in very early, experimental stages of development. The point here is not to recommend one system or to criticize another. Rather, it's hoped that this menu of approaches will stimulate other school systems to consider what might be done in their communities, and to copy or adapt any of these ideas.

In doing so, it is important to be aware of the variables and allow for them. They include the labor-relations environment; regional differences that reflect geography or culture or economies; and state laws and other factors, like the quality of local leadership, that distinguish each district.

Advisory Communications

Advisory communications strategies stop short of shared authority. More typically, they involve outreach efforts by the school board or superintendent to bring teachers into policy-making through consultation and informal processes. Committees which are advisory in nature can have a profound impact on the decisions of the school leadership without limiting the options available to school leaders. Advisory communications devices can work well both within a collective bargaining framework and in districts where bargaining does not occur.

Johnson City, TX: Vertical Team Consensual Planning

In the schools of Johnson City, a rural central Texas community that was home to President Lyndon B. Johnson, teachers are involved in a consensual planning process through the use of a vertical team—a planning group formed with members from every level in the district. The board members and superintendents participate but do not control the process. A board member, the superintendent, two principals and three teachers (there are 34 in the three-school system with 509 students) meet each month for planning, assisted by consultants from the University of Texas and with foundation funds. The teachers volunteer their time and are chosen by the principals. Teachers are members of either the Texas State Teachers Association or the Association of Texas Professional Educators.

Johnson City last year formed a community campaign to pass a school bond issue, and when it succeeded, enthusiasm was high enough that the district developed its School Improvement Process, a team of 40 teachers, parents and business leaders working to develop a vision of where the school district should be headed. They call it "Nine Steps for the Nineties."

Contact: Superintendent, Johnson City Independent School District, P.O. Box 98, Johnson City, TX 78636, (512) 868-7410.

Dallas TX: Ombudsmen and Involvement

Dallas is one of the largest school systems in the country (140,000 students, 7,500 teachers) without collective bargaining. Five teacher organizations have members, but none has formal recognition. Instead, the district relies upon five full-time ombudsmen, paid at the same level as teachers, to visit the 200 Dallas schools and listen to teachers, cutting through red tape to resolve their complaints. The program was put in place in 1970 as an alternative to a more formal grievance process. Ombudsmen have broad authority to investigate and make recommendations, reporting directly to the assistant superintendent.

A second program, Operation Involvement, requires the election or appointment of teachers from each school to serve on the 24 committees working on budgetary and instructional policy proposals to be submitted to the school board. The committees meet monthly (teachers get released time), and once a year representatives from the 24 committees go on a two-day retreat with board members and administrators.

A third program deals narrowly with salary and benefit issues, featuring a district communications committee that works directly with representatives of all the unions in an informal process.

Contact: Superintendent, Dallas Independent School District, 3807 Ross Ave., Dallas, TX 75204, (214) 824-1620.

Falmouth, MA: Teachers and Committees

Although teachers have collective bargaining in Massachusetts, in Falmouth most of the instruction-related activities involving teachers flow out of half a dozen curriculum and goals-setting

committees made up of teachers and administrators. Selected by the administration from teachers volunteering to serve, committee members are given eight to 15 days of released time to do their work both in planning and in establishing criteria for teacher evaluations. Supervisors do the actual evaluations through classroom observations, but the teachers have set many of the objectives by which they are evaluated.

Falmouth is one of the larger communities on Cape Cod, with 6,500 students attending the schools, drawn from other villages and towns. There are 150 teachers. The teacher-administrator committees have evolved over the last three to four years. They have not been subject to collective bargaining, although the superintendent recently agreed to discuss stipends for the participating teachers with the NEA-affiliated teacher union. Recommendations of the committees go to the superintendent and, sometimes, to the school board.

Contact: Superintendent, Falmouth School District, 340 Teaticket Hwy., Teaticket, MA 02536, (617) 548-0151.

Chandler, AZ: Monthly Breakfast Meetings

Chandler Unified School District No. 80, in the suburbs of Phoenix, has improved its communications by developing principal and teacher teams to review and evaluate the current school year's management goals and to choose members of the next school management team. The superintendent supplements this more structured form of communications with monthly informal breakfast meetings with teachers and classified employees, held in the district board room. Attendance is by invitation (about 30 are invited each time), in a letter explaining which subjects are on the table and soliciting questions or other discussion topics. Each breakfast begins with a brief overview of the district's activities by the superintendent, followed by discussion and questions. Surveys indicate that 86 percent of those teachers participating thought the breakfast meetings were worthwhile.

Chandler schools have an enrollment of 9,106 students, with 526 teachers. There is no collective bargaining, but an informal meet-and-confer arrangement exists with the NEA affiliate. Eight of the school district's 11 schools rank among the best in the state.

Contact: Superintendent, Chandler Unified School District No. 80, 500 W. Galveston St., Chandler, AZ 85224, (602) 786-7000.

Mason City, IA: Staff Committees

Mason City, located in the fertile plains of north central Iowa, has 4,790 students and 320 teachers. There is a state collective bargaining law, with the Iowa NEA affiliate representing the teachers.

Mason City schools have implemented a decentralization program that involves staff committees and administrative structures aimed at keeping teachers and administrators well informed. There are four main staff committees: a certified staff advisory committee which meets regularly with the superintendent and includes a teacher-selected representative from every school; a classified staff advisory committee, similarly chosen, which also meets with the superintendent; a staff enhancement committee which meets with the assistant superintendent to plan staff in-service and development programs; and a curriculum committee made up of teachers and administrators from all curriculum areas. In addition, each school building has an oversight committee made up of teacher and classified staff representatives and the principal.

Contact: Superintendent, Mason City Community Schools, 1515 S. Pennsylvania, Mason City, IA 50401, (515) 423-7249.

Fargo, ND: Discussing Non-negotiable Issues

Fargo Public Schools, with 9,500 students and 500 teachers, has a traditional collective bargaining agreement with teachers represented by the local NEA affiliate. But after some tense negotiations a few years ago, the school board encouraged the creation of a Committee for Teacher-Board Relations which meets once or twice per month during the school year.

Two or three board members and a group of teachers selected by the teachers' association always participate, with administrators and other interested parties involved less frequently. The discussions center around teacher concerns that are non-negotiable, such as class size, long-range planning, student discipline, corporal punishment, smoking, in-service education and school finance. The committee serves as an advisory adjunct to the board but has no legal authority. Meetings are public and are often reported on in the local newspaper.

Since the process began, formal negotiations between the board and the teachers' association have moved faster and more smoothly. The arrangement allows individual teachers to be heard and has strengthened understanding between board members and teachers.

Contact: Superintendent, Fargo Public Schools, 1104 Second Ave. South, Fargo, ND 58103, (701) 241-4801.

Farmington, NM: Borrowing from Tulsa

After a period of tension between the school board and the NEA-affiliated teachers' association, Farmington school officials borrowed and modi-

fied a program from the Tulsa, OK, schools called the Teams Management Committee to help identify and resolve problems within the system without conflict. New Mexico schools do not have formal collective bargaining.

The Teams Management Committee provides for low-level problem resolution without the delegation of authority from the school board. The committee is made up of a principal, a central office administrator, a parent, union and nonunion teachers, the superintendent and a business representative. It meets monthly during the school year and examines education issues and employee concerns. Its advisory recommendations then go to the school board, where they have been taken seriously.

Board representatives say that while there is no quantitative measurement of the committee's effectiveness, the level of conflict between the teachers' association and the superintendent has largely evaporated since the committee's creation. Employee morale has improved and the district's public image has also been enhanced, school officials say. A precondition to these results has been the willingness of the board to listen to the committee and to follow its suggestions most of the time. The superintendent also has given substantial time and support to committee activities.

School district staff are kept abreast of the committee meetings through a newsletter. Farmington is a community in northwestern New Mexico with 8,545 students and 500 teachers. About one-third of the students qualify for the school lunch program.

Contact: Superintendent, Farmington Municipal Schools, Box 660, Farmington, NM 87401, (505) 325-3531.

Canyon, TX: Teacher Advisory Committees

The growing northwest Texas town of Canyon, with nearly 5,600 students and 329 teachers, uses two advisory committees to make sure that teacher concerns reach the superintendent and the board of this rural-suburban district. The Teacher Advisory Council considers such issues of district-wide impact as wages, benefits and working conditions, school calendar and career ladder policies. It is made up of teacher representatives elected from each school, who serve two-year terms, and school board representatives or staff.

A second standing committee is known as the Instructional Advisory Council, which gathers information from teachers on basic educational policy concerns. This council is appointed by the superintendent and made up of at least two teachers per school who are members of the Texas State Teachers Association, serving for two-year staggered terms. Recent changes in state law mandating instructional programs threaten to undermine this program.

Contact: Superintendent, Canyon Independent School District, P.O. Box 899, Canyon, TX 79015, (806) 655-1081.

Pasadena, TX: Two-way Communications

Like Dallas and Richardson, Pasadena is a large urban school system without structured collective bargaining. An old, industrial suburb of Houston, Pasadena has some 36,000 students and 2,000 teachers.

One representative for every 25 teachers is elected to serve on the district-wide communications committee. These representatives meet in groups after school to discuss both labor-management and instructional issues. The success of collaborative efforts depends heavily upon principal interest and leadership. Proposals are presented to the administration through the personnel director. There is no collective bargaining, but the NEA affiliate meets informally on an as-needed basis with the superintendent, and both sides say the relationship works.

Pasadena faculty representatives conduct a needs-assessment survey once or twice a year, circulating written forms that ask individual teachers to list the changes they'd like to see in the schools.

Contact: Superintendent, Pasadena Independent School District, P.O. Box 1799, Pasadena, TX 77501, (713) 944-7411.

Teacher Recognition and Professional Development

"The deepest principle in human nature is the craving to be appreciated," wrote American philosopher William James. At their core, teacher recognition and professional development programs are simply acknowledging this well-known fact: everyone wants to be noticed and rewarded for a job well done.

Teacher recognition programs can be as uncomplicated as a simple luncheon awards ceremony, in which teachers chosen by the school district, by their peers or by a mechanism that involves students and parents receive an award. Most communities have a "Teacher of the Year" program that singles out top teachers in various categories for recognition. Sometimes these are run by the school district. In other instances, outside organizations—a civic club or a newspaper—will oversee the program.

School districts also use financial incentives and professional development programs to encourage accomplished teachers to take on more responsibility, such as peer evaluation, guidance and improvement training.

The Toledo, OH, program described

later in this chapter involves both decentralized decision-making and teacher development incentives. Teachers helping teachers can translate into teachers taking responsibility not just for the successes but also for the weaknesses of the teaching program. AFT President Albert Shanker has said that in the Toledo program the union is taking the lead for "shaping up and, if necessary, shipping out" members of Toledo's teaching force.

Others familiar with the program say there have been few instances of teachers being "shipped out," but they add that the program, which matches the system's acknowledged best teachers with new teachers, is working well in terms of building confidence and showing the newcomers what works, early in their careers. The Toledo Intern Intervention Program serves as an example of how teacher recognition can be as rewarding for the system as it is for the honored teacher.

These are a few examples of more sophisticated teacher recognition and professional development programs:

Westport, CT: The BEST Program

In negotiations with the local NEA affiliate, the school board in Westport, an affluent community near the New York line (eight schools, 4,034 students, 490 teachers), agreed to creation of a new "teacher leader" job category, which paid an additional 5 percent above the base salary and could be awarded either to an individual or a group of teachers. These designees, who must meet criteria set by the board, take on mentor work with new teachers in addition to their normal teaching assignments.

The Beginning Educators Support program (BEST) aims at getting new teachers off to a strong start. Mentors are trained over three weekends, and monthly meetings are held for the new teachers and their mentors, at which a wide range of issues are discussed and questions asked. Westport currently has 10 new teachers and 10 mentors.

Contact: Superintendent, Westport Public Schools, 110 Myrtle Ave., Westport, CT 06880, (203) 227-8451.

Florissant, MO: Using Federal Funds for Mini-grants

The Ferguson-Florissant School District serves 11,700 students in the St. Louis suburbs. The district has 800 teachers represented by the NEA affiliate in 25 schools and serves a fairly homogeneous community. In 1986 the district superintendent charged his advisory committee with finding ways to provide funds for instructional improvement directly to teachers.

The advisory committee developed a competitive application process and encouraged teachers to apply for the money, drawing funds from the Chapter II federal block grant. A Mini-grant Steering Committee was created, made up of 15 teachers and administrators representing all grade levels, to judge applications. Each applicant was asked only to briefly indicate need, target population, goals and objectives, activities, evaluation procedures and expected outcomes. With $50,000 set aside, some 78 applications rolled in requesting project funding totalling $170,000.

Special instructional projects funded by the grants ranged from field trips for teachers and principals to visit effective school programs and bring back plans to adapt them, to the creation of a writing and publishing center for elementary school students.

Contact: Superintendent, Ferguson-Florissant School District, 1005 Waterford Dr., Florissant, MO 63033, (314) 831-4411.

Port Clinton, OH: Intern Review Program

Patterned after the Toledo program, Port Clinton City Schools (2,389 students and 150 teachers) have initiated an entry-year program for new teachers involving peer review and peer mentoring. Teachers are members of the local AFT.

A "consulting teacher," chosen by the Intern Review Program Board (IRPB), is assigned to each new teacher for a year and evaluates the teacher after that year. The IRPB is made up of four teachers chosen by the teachers' union and four administrators. Each consulting teacher is given 30 hours of released time and receives a $1,500 annual stipend.

The consulting teacher evaluates the intern on classroom performance—both on mastery of subject area content and teaching performance. The building principal evaluates the intern on adherence to building policy. At the end of the year the consulting teacher presents a written evaluation of the intern to the Intern Review Program Board with a recommendation on whether an additional one-year contract should be awarded to the new teacher. The IRPB passes on its recommendation to the superintendent, who with the school board makes the final decision. The program began in the 1987-88 school year. It was jointly developed by the union and superintendent over an 18-month period, but was not formally bargained nor is it incorporated in the board policy on teacher evaluation; it is considered an experiment.

Early evidence suggests it is working well, with new teachers expressing appreciation for the assistance they receive, and consulting teachers developing an appreciation for the complexity of conducting evaluations.

Contact: Superintendent, Port Clinton Board of Education, Port Clinton, OH 43452, (419) 732-2102.

Mitchell, SD: The Professional Involvement Bonus

Beginning about 1984, Mitchell's school district (2,900 students, 185 teachers) undertook to recognize and pay teachers for work performed outside the classroom that went beyond their normal extra duty schedules. The Professional Involvement Bonus Program was meant to supplement the admittedly low teacher salaries and to provide incentives for additional activities. Under its union agreement with the local NEA affiliate, the district pays teachers according to a salary scale based on degrees and experience. The annual bonus program was not included in the agreement, although a contractually designated team determines who receives the extra money. For the current year, $15,000 is set aside, with bonuses of up to $250 allocated for 40 to 50 teachers.

The district recently has begun a review of the program after observing that some teachers are assuming they should receive a financial reward for minimum efforts outside the classroom. In general, however, the district central office remains supportive. The program has been widely publicized through the local newspaper and school district newsletters. School board meetings are televised and the bonuses are announced there, as well.

Contact: Superintendent, Mitchell Public Schools, 117 E. Fourth Ave., Mitchell, SD 57301, (605) 996-6671.

Avondale, AZ: Superior Teacher Awards

Avondale's administration and teachers have gone back to the drawing board this year after running into complications in their annual "Superior Teacher" awards program. Both the NEA affiliate and the administration in this rural suburban district near Phoenix (four schools, 137 teachers, 2,700 students, about half Hispanic and other minorities) agreed they needed to find more objective criteria for deciding who and what is "superior," although they remain committed to the awards concept. Fearful that the program was becoming a popularity contest, the system is now looking at developing a better peer review or evaluation program. The system also is expanding its use of building-wide and district-wide teacher-administrator committees on academic issues.

Contact: Avondale School District 44, 235 W. Western Ave., Avondale, AZ 85323, (602) 932-0840.

Alternative Negotiating Techniques

Some of the best ideas for enhancing communications within the schools were born in the ashes of failure. Looking for ways to heal the wounds after a teacher strike or following unpleasant negotiations has led districts to develop innovative and sometimes remarkably successful new approaches to team-building. Still other districts have worked without collective bargaining to develop trusting, collegial relationships.

These are samples of creative efforts taking place around the country:

Moscow, ID: New Harmony

Efforts to improve communications in 1987 through creation of a Harmony Committee made up of top administrators and teachers' union leaders in Moscow, ID, didn't prevent a nine-day strike from occurring a few months later. But in the aftermath of the strike, efforts at better dialogue continued and both sides agree that, as a result, things are better all around. Moscow, a university town in northern Idaho (2,632 students, 171 teachers) borrowed the Harmony Committee idea from the nearby Lewiston school district and, in 1988, adapted a monthly breakfast program in use in the Pocatello school district. (All three districts have teachers represented by Idaho Education Association affiliates.)

In Moscow, the harmony committee of six—three from the union and three from the administration—meets monthly to talk about issues ranging from curriculum to paycheck distribution problems to pay for substitute teachers. The result has been grievances averted and small issues taken directly to the school board for quick action. The give-and-take of collective bargaining has become smoother as well. This year the district and the association signed a three-year agreement after only four weeks of negotiations.

The breakfast meetings began in 1988 with participation by school board members, association leadership and selected administrators, including the superintendent. They intend to use the sessions to explore such subjects as the calls for school reform and decentralized decision-making, although significant changes would require negotiations and board approval.

Contact: Superintendent, Moscow School District 281, 410 E. Third St., Moscow, ID 83843, (208) 882-1120.

Glen Ellyn, IL: New Cooperation

Facing a $10 million deficit and unpleasant contract negotiations, school officials in the Glenbard Township High School District 87 (7,300 students in grades 9-12) decided to try a new kind of bargaining that emphasized cooperation over confrontation.

After looking at nearby districts for models, in February 1987 the labor-management steering committee drew up a negotiating schedule that called for reaching agreement by May. Each side brought an expanded team, 15 members, to the process, which began

with a get-acquainted dinner and an exchange of one-page personal and professional profiles to get away from the traditional "us-vs.-them" mentality. A consultant was brought in for a day of training that focused on successful private sector cooperative ventures in bargaining.

Once the issues were on the table, a committee of board and union leaders decided to divide them into two classes: issues to be negotiated formally (such as salaries) and those to be resolved less formally (such as complaints about the grading system). Seven subcommittees were organized to focus on specific issues. Each reached conclusions over the next five weeks and brought back the results to the larger committee, where the board and union president alternated as president. The district's teachers are members of a local NEA affiliate.

To reach the agreed-upon deadline, the last couple of sessions were extended and, occasionally, tense. Nevertheless, the group got there, signing a contract three months before the old agreement expired. In the aftermath a standing committee made up of many of the same players meets regularly to keep communications open and resolve issues as they develop.

Contact: Superintendent, Glenbard Township High School District 87, 800 Roosevelt Bldg. East, Glen Ellyn, IL 60137, (312) 469-9100.

Yarmouth, ME: Using "Win-Win" Bargaining

As in many other districts, officials in Yarmouth (1,500 students, 95 teachers) were looking to avoid conflict when they approached association representatives about hiring a consultant who advocated "Win-Win" bargaining strategies. A labor relations consultant was invited in from Florida to address the school committee and the teachers' local NEA chapter leadership and was hired to facilitate discussions between the two groups over a two-day period. In addition to the teachers' union and management, a retired teacher, a parent, a school principal and a town councilor were brought into the discussions. Subcommittees were set up to tackle various specific issues and work out acceptable solutions.

The talks centered primarily on economics, but other agreements came out of the process as well, such as using teachers in the teacher-hiring process. The superintendent believes the process worked because the modified environment did not allow for adversarial positioning to occur, and thus the bargaining process was more rational. The cost of the facilitator was shared by the parties.

Contact: Superintendent, Yarmouth School District, 8 Portland St., Yarmouth, ME 04096, (207) 846-5586.

Pekin, IL: "Win-Win" Again

Like Yarmouth, Pekin is a small town district (4,000 students, 250 teachers) with a history of bitter negotiations. Prior to 1984 negotiations took 10 months to reach a tense conclusion. In 1984 the district hired the same consultant used in Yarmouth and tried a similar approach.

Twenty-four people came to the negotiating table, including the entire school board, the superintendent and his central office staff, the district's lawyer and 12 teacher representatives. They worked hard with the facilitator and reached an agreement in three weeks.

More recently they repeated the process without the consultant, using instead the director of the Illinois Association of School Administrators and a representative of the Illinois Education Association (NEA) to facilitate the sessions.

In the happy aftermath, the superintendent now has a monthly session with the teachers' union and has brought teachers into a number of new areas of shared responsibility. There is some thought that the continuing communications can lead to a periodic rolling over of the contract with only a few needed changes to update financial issues.

Contact: Superintendent, Pekin School District 108, 501 Washington, Pekin, IL 61555, (309) 346-3151.

Helena, MT: Collective Gains

In 1976 after negotiations broke down and a strike seemed likely, the president of the teachers' association and the school board chairman agreed to create a Collective Gains Committee to get away from the adversarial process of bargaining. The process has been a continuous one. Helena is a small city with 7,600 students and 559 teachers, and the teachers are represented by local NEA.

Bargaining group members are picked by the two sides and consist of four teachers, two trustees and two administrators, serving for two-year terms. The Collective Gains Committee meets weekly from May until February, without much public attention, serving as the hub for discussion of school affairs and for creating subcommittees to look at specific problems or potential issues, from insurance to curriculum design. The parties avoid coming to the table with demands, but rather put issues on the table for discussion and resolution, with a six-vote majority required to reach a conclusion. No subject is considered off limits, but management rights are respected. The school board has always ratified the committee recommendations.

If a contract hasn't been reached by February 1, the pace of talks escalates. If the school board or union fails to ratify the agreement, then the process reverts to traditional bargaining—although in 12 years that has never happened. The Collective Gains Committee produces a monthly newsletter, and a similar building-level mini-structure has been developed, adding parents to the mix.

Contact: Superintendent, Helena School District, 7th and Allen Sts., Helena, MT 59601, (406) 442-2500.

Pasco, WA: After a Strike

It took a 10-day strike to get them there, but the Pasco Association of Educators and school leaders in Pasco (340 teachers, 6,400 students, including a large number who are interim students, the children of migrant farm workers), in eastern Washington, have used various forms of "Win Win" bargaining since 1980. It went sour for a while as the players changed and bargaining team members with less experience and less devotion to the collegial process moved in. After some rocky moments, the parties revised their ground rules, which called for negotiating in a small, informal setting and discouraged complex contract proposals. They changed the physical layout and got rid of the bargaining table, dropped their boilerplate proposals and stressed listening to each other.

In 1987, the district entered a three-year contract, but the monthly meetings continued. Both union and school leaders admit that they did not do enough to keep their constituents informed of the outcome of the monthly "win" sessions earlier, and some mistrust was created. Meetings now are held over breakfast, with the superintendent usually sitting in, with discussions ranging from labor issues to school tax issues and the need for teachers' association support to training for the substance abuse program. Problem-solving committees are created on an ad hoc basis.

Contact: Superintendent, Pasco School District, 1004 N. 16th Ave., Pasco, WA 99301, (509) 547-9531.

Vermillion, SD: A Contract After Four Meetings

Bargaining often has been easier in small districts like Vermillion (1,400 students, 120 teachers, four schools) because school board members, administrators and teachers all live close together and know each other. Nevertheless, Vermillion school negotiations had harsh moments prior to 1986, when the association and school administration tried a cooperative process that resulted in an agreement after just four meetings. At the table were the president of the teachers' group and a representative from each school, with the superintendent, a board member who served as chief negotiator, the business manager and other board members there representing management.

The parties began with agreement on the state of school finances, working jointly to develop a single set of revenue figures. The parties shared the cost of hiring an outside accountant to work with the school business manager and develop projected revenue levels. They also agreed from the start that they wanted a contract that moved them toward a common goal: excellence in education. That led them to work toward creating a trustful atmosphere and recognizing that both sides needed to come away with "wins" at the table. Vermillion teachers belong to an NEA affiliate.

Contact: Superintendent, Vermillion District 13-1, 127 Linden Ave., Vermillion, SD 57069, (605) 624-8051.

Forest Park, IL: Integrated Communications

Forest Park began an approach that it, too, calls "Collective Gaining" in 1972. It stresses a process in which the needs of all parties are placed on the table for integrated bargaining discussions. It works, according to local administrators, when participants are open with each other and listen objectively, when the parties are eager to try to accommodate each other and when the communication of ideas and recommendations is unrestricted and hostility minimized.

Forest Park, which has no teachers' unions, is a community of 15,000 near Chicago (859 students, 76 teachers, four schools) and uses a Gaining Committee made up of five teachers, the superintendent, a principal and two board members. While each speaks from the perspective he or she represents, committee members strive to remain flexible and seek compromise. The goal is to find solutions that benefit the whole group. The process is year-round, with meetings every month and special meetings as required. As a result, time pressures stemming from deadlines are minimized. Votes are avoided in favor of a search for consensus. The process allows items to be carried over from one meeting to the next, with interim solutions where necessary, and allows teachers and the administration regular access to the discussions.

Principals are encouraged to participate by sharing their reaction to proposed agreements with the teachers before the agreements are formalized. Gaining in Forest Park has enabled board members to learn a great deal about the problems facing teachers and administrators. Teachers are given released time to meet monthly with their representatives on the Gaining Committee and offer opinions about items under discussion. In-service programs help members of the committee learn about group decision-making. Minutes of each committee meeting are distributed to the district staff, board members, teachers, PTA

leaders and members of the local Citizens Advisory Committee.

Gaining has been used in Forest Park to resolve such diverse problems as staff reductions, teacher salary scheduling, student progress reporting, medical insurance coverage, student-teacher guidelines, curriculum development and program improvement priorities and school calendar issues.

Contact: Superintendent, Forest Park School District 91, 939 Beloit Ave., Forest Park, IL 60130, (312) 366-5700.

Decentralized Decision-making

Decentralized decision-making, obviously, translates into different things in different places. Nevertheless, the Commission has seen in diverse places and projects a pattern of improving administration in which authority is shared and choices are made each day by teachers and principals, working collegially, at the school site.

In a large-scale test of decentralized decision-making, the National Education Association began in 1985 what it calls the Mastery in Learning Project. From over 1,400 applicants NEA selected 27 schools in 19 states to participate in the four-and-a-half-year reform experiment. The 27-school network, representing urban, suburban and rural communities, includes some 20,280 students, 1,200 teachers, 454 support staff and 64 site-based administrators.

The purpose of the project is to help local principals and teachers restructure schools so that students can master what is taught. In restructuring the schools, the project focuses on four principles: a school's curriculum must have content integrity and social significance; a community must hold high expectations for its students; the priorities of teaching, learning and curriculum must guide all other educational decisions; and every decision about learning and instruction that can be made by a local school faculty must be made by that faculty.

The project is funded in part by the NEA along with local and state school funds and contributions from foundations and the private sector. Several federally funded regional educational laboratories and universities are involved. For further information contact the NEA Mastery in Learning Center, 1201 16th St. NW, Washington, DC 20036-3290, (202) 822-7907.

What follows are school districts that have implemented interesting and effective programs to move decision-making closer to the school site.

Hammond, IN: The School Improvement Process (SIP)

A steel town of 100,000 near Chicago in northwestern Indiana, Hammond has felt the pain of economic retrenchment in recent years. Some 15,000 children attend Hammond schools, and the 930 teachers are represented by a unit of the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). In 1985, the union and the district negotiated an agreement by which teachers, on a school-by-school basis, could set aside provisions in their contract to implement school improvement plans. Called the School Improvement Process (SIP), participants hope that this building-based method of school management will bring significant improvement in the quality of education while allowing each school to develop as a separate culture.

SIP now is district-wide in 25 schools, but it began as a pilot project at Hammond High School, supported by foundations and special state funds. Hammond High once was a top-ranked school that declined during the seventies. Academic achievement was low and racial tension, vandalism rates, drug abuse and violence were soaring. Teacher morale was poor. An improvement committee of 15 to 20 teachers, administrators, parents, students and community members was pulled together to try to change things—creating a model that has since been replicated in other schools. A core team of the principal, a couple of teachers and a parent sets the agenda. The principal is never the chairman. The district's SIP coordinator, a teacher, provides initial training for participants and then encourages them to train others in consensus-building, brainstorming, creative problem-solving and group dynamics. Final decisions are made in the school by those who must live with them, with one constraint: no school can make a decision that negatively affects another school.

In the Hammond High pilot project, school attendance went up 3.3 percent the first year, membership in the parent organization soared from seven to 300 and academic failures declined by 383 students. The next year the SIP program spread to three other schools and showed similar signs of success. It became system-wide in the 1986-87 school year. The SIP coordinator for the school district is a teacher granted half-time release to carry out his activities. He receives a small stipend for his extra work. In each school the SIP team's first task is planning, developing a "vision of excellence" for the school and a five- or 10-year program, with long- and short-term goals and priorities sorted out. Often this is done at a weekend retreat out of the community.

Communications are enhanced through "pyramiding," with each SIP team member required to interact regularly with up to seven peers and share feedback, with each peer replicating that activity. In 1987, the school district received $66,000 from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to pay for staff and training. Released time is available with clearance from the central office, so that

SIP teams can meet during the school day every week or two. The union and the superintendent are working together to change state mandates on the number of hours and minutes children and teachers must spend in the classrooms, to provide added flexibility for SIP efforts.

No district-wide measurements are available yet. There are signs of slippage at Hammond High after its spectacular start. Still, school and teacher union leaders are positive about the entire effort.

Contact: Superintendent, Hammond Independent Schools, 5935 Homan Avenue, Hammond, IN 46319, (219) 932-5700.

Broward County, FL: An Evolving School-based Management System

Long before the Carnegie group and the governors were beating the drums for decentralization, some districts were well along the road. The Florida legislature in 1976 passed its Educational Accountability Act calling for concentrated authority for decision-making at the individual school. With that push, the Broward County school system put into place components of a comprehensive accountability system for school-based management. Broward's rapidly-growing county-wide system encompasses nearly 170 schools in Fort Lauderdale and a number of suburban communities along South Florida's beach-line, where snowbird migration and the influx of Cuban and Haitian refugees have led to a population boom. The system serves 137,000 students and employs 8,300 teachers, who are represented for collective bargaining by the Broward Teachers Union (AFT).

Participation by staff and community representatives in the decision-making process and the shifting of major responsibility for budgetary and instructional decisions to the building level are central factors in the Broward program. It begins with a competency-based curriculum put together with elaborate teacher consultation through faculty curriculum councils and adopted by the school board for district-wide application. State law requires parent advisory councils district-wide and for each school, separate from (although clearly overlapping) traditional PTA groups. Each school determines which staffing patterns, methods and materials are best for its students' needs and teaching force. The district has a computerized system able to provide the classroom teacher, principal and district planners with a record of student achievement.

The district also has developed training programs for principals and other line administrators to give them the skills they need for their modified management roles. Individual schools make their own spending decisions with state funds passed directly on by the district using the same state formula that applies district-wide. Although principals have wide authority, the most recent contract with the teachers' union sets in place a joint committee to work toward principal-teacher collaborative management. Broward officials are encouraging PTAs and community groups to become active in the planning and budgeting process for each school.

Contact: Superintendent, Broward County School District, 1320 S.W. 4th St., Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33312, (305) 765-6198.

Dade County, FL: Building a Model Urban Program

Dade County, FL, has a bit of everything: sprawling troubled Miami with its racial tension, drug traffic and constant influx of immigrants; wealthy suburbs like Bal Harbour and Key Biscayne, where presidents have romped with the powerful; and a substantial population of retirees. It's the nation's fourth largest school system, with its 260 schools serving some 255,000 students from the county's 1.8 million population. About three-fourths of the students are Hispanic or Black, and 40 percent enter school with limited English. Enrollment is expected to top 300,000 by 1991. Teachers in the system bargain collectively through an AFT-affiliated union.

In 1985 the union and school board launched a comprehensive effort to improve the schools and enhance the education profession. One initiative in this effort is a school-based management/shared decision-making pilot program involving 44 schools, which gives teachers and administrators maximum freedom to try new ideas. School district rules and contract provisions have been waived by agreement to allow each individual school leeway to experiment with changes in class sizes, the length of classes and the school day and even the frequency with which report cards are issued. Principals and teachers create their own school-based management arrangements and work together to cut through red tape and collaborate on teaching the children.

School and union officials hope the Dade County program will become a model for large urban districts. It gives principals and teachers greater spending autonomy than they've ever had. In several schools staff patterns have changed as the principal and teachers decided to replace assistant principals with new teachers and aides. A comprehensive evaluation of the Dade County program is expected to be published in June 1990.

Other professionalization initiatives include the Dade Academy for the Teaching Arts, which provides mini-sabbaticals for outstanding teachers, and QUIIP, the Quality Instruction Incentives Program, which provides

pay incentives for teachers and administrators who succeed in cooperative efforts to improve instruction and achieve measurable excellence.

Contact: Superintendent, Dade County School District, 1410 N.E. 2nd Ave., Miami, FL 33132, (305) 350-3190.

New Haven, CT: The Comer Project

Educational excellence is something that outsiders might naturally expect of New Haven, CT, home of Yale University. But New Haven is also home to 126,000 permanent residents, a majority of them poor and Black or Hispanic. The city has the maladies associated with old, declining eastern industrial communities. It also has the Comer project, which began as a study in ways to uplift children of indigent origins and make them educationally competitive. Teachers are represented by a local AFT chapter.

At the Martin Luther King Elementary School (K-4, 225 students) Yale psychiatrist James P. Comer designed a pilot project to determine whether school-based decision-making by teachers and others in intensive contact with children from low-income, high-risk communities could make a difference. A School Planning Management Team made up of several teachers, MLK's principal and parents drew up a plan to meet student achievement goals and help the children develop social skills, improve staff development and deal with problems specific to the neighborhood. The principal retains authority but most decisions are reached through consensus. A mental health team is available to the school. Parents have been enlisted as classroom aides, which serves both to improve discipline and to help the parents acquire employment skills. These parents help activate others, and participation is high.

Next fall, the district will expand the Comer model into "Project Excel," in 10-12 schools, seeking to expand school-based governance over a period of time. In the first phase, comprehensive staff development programs are planned to increase teacher, administrator and support staff skills in dealing with students deemed "at-risk." These training programs will be assembled by teams comprised of teachers and administrators, working with consultants. Each school will be charged with setting its own priorities and preparing its own budget, with principals required to consult with teachers, administrators and parents and obtain written agreement with the school plan. Future plans call for experimenting with student-parent management teams in the middle and high schools, to encourage still greater parental involvement.

At Martin Luther King Elementary, the results have been impressive. When the program began, the school ranked last among 33 elementary schools in the city. In 1987, with no significant change in the makeup of its community, the students were scoring 18 months above grade level on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Contact: Superintendent, New Haven Schools, 200 Orange St., New Haven, CT 06510, (203) 787-8888.

Granville County, NC: Teacher Freedom in a Rural District

Granville County School District serves some 7,200 students and has 375 teachers in a rural and small town county in north central North Carolina. It's one of three systems in the state participating in a pilot lead teacher program, created by state legislative action. Two of the county's 12 schools are exempted from all state education regulations and guidelines and given maximum freedom during the life of the project. The objective is to decentralize decision-making by developing and using lead teachers in each school, and to work out site-based participatory decision-making.

The project was conceived by the North Carolina Public School Forum. Although many Granville teachers belong to the NEA-affiliated North Carolina Association of Educators, there is no collective bargaining in the state. In the participating schools, lead teachers are selected by their colleagues and devote half of each school day to managing school operations, including staff development. Each lead teacher heads a team of 12 teachers. Lead teachers receive supplemental income from a state grant program and replacement teachers pick up their class load. Granville County Schools is designing its own accountability system to evaluate the pilot project, with a grant from the National Governors' Association.

Each school in the county was advised of the planned project, according to the school superintendent. As a condition for participation, at least 75 percent of the teachers in a school had to endorse the activity. Granville spent a year planning its program and implemented it at the beginning of the 1987-88 school year.

Contact: Superintendent of Schools, Granville County School District, 101 Delacroix St., Oxford, NC 27565, (919) 693-4613.

Rochester, NY: Responding to Carnegie

School officials and local AFT leaders in Rochester read the Carnegie Forum's 1986 report, *A Nation Prepared,* and went to work. Last year they negotiated a comprehensive collective bargaining agreement that increases teachers' salaries an average of 40 percent over three years and creates a new four-tiered Career in Teaching Program. It provides that up to 10 percent of the teaching staff of 2,400 will become lead teachers, provided they have at least 10 years of

experience and meet high performance standards. Lead teachers will work longer hours and waive seniority rights for classroom assignments. They're expected to tackle the toughest challenges, to become (in the words of one New York education official) "the Clint Eastwoods of public education." In addition, they serve as mentors, intervention teachers and instruction leaders. Rochester is a large urban district in upstate New York with 37,000 students, two-thirds of them Black or Hispanic. The city is the corporate headquarters of two Fortune 500 giants, Xerox Corporation and Eastman Kodak. It's also a growing high-technology center.

The Career in Teaching Program is aimed at attracting the best new college graduates into teaching in Rochester as interns, then developing them into resident teachers (experienced but without full certification and tenure) and, finally, professional teachers. At the upper levels of its salary scales, the new contract makes Rochester's teachers the highest paid in the country. As a trade-off for the pay increases, the union agreed to stretch the school year to 190 days, to eliminate seniority as the primary factor in teacher transfers and to establish a peer intervention program in which expert teachers work with other teachers deemed in need of remedial training, providing the latter are willing. Teachers are encouraged to continue taking college courses, and tuition reimbursement is available.

Contact: Superintendent, Rochester School District, 131 West Broad St., Rochester, NY 14608, (716) 325-4560.

Southern California: New Management in the Schools

About an hour southwest of Los Angeles, the ABC Unified School District serves an ethnically diverse student population of 220,000 students, 60 percent of them Hispanic or Asian. The district has 950 teachers and bargains with an AFT local. During the past decade, teachers took on new authority stemming from a joint arrangement by district management and union leaders and buoyed by the availability of state funds for teacher development and a university intervention program.

During the 1986-87 school years, teachers oversaw curriculum development and textbook adoption, were given firm control over more than $1 million in curriculum and staff development funds, helped assign teachers and students, established student routines and set disciplinary policies. Teachers helped develop an evaluation procedure for certificated employees and selected and evaluated their peers for positions as mentor teachers. The district budget has been decentralized so that each school controls more of its expenditures.

The changes began back in the 1970s with the encouragement of the then-superintendent. He took the lead in concentrating authority in the schools by winnowing the number of management levels and staff between the superintendent and the principals. He promoted participatory management "associations" for principals, assistant principals and other administrators. Each group met regularly to discuss issues among themselves and met every two or three months with the superintendent. The heads of each association came together as a Management Teaching Administrative Council, which met regularly with the superintendent.

Control of the curriculum was placed entirely in teacher hands by the creation of 10 district-wide subject area committees and a curriculum master plan council. Representative teachers from each school serve on the subject committees. Each subject committee elects its own chair, who serves also on the master plan council.

Beginning in 1982-83, the district started bringing teachers into school leadership by appointing Instructional Resource Teachers (IRTs) to provide leadership for teachers and work with the principal on instructional issues. Initially, they were picked by the principals, but last year there was a formal selection process, and IRTs received extra pay. In 1984-85, the state established its Mentor Teacher program, with the union selecting mentor teachers. Between the two, nearly 30 percent of the teachers in the district took on extra responsibilities.

This year, the district suffered major funding cuts in state support which undercut much of the progress. Curriculum committees meet less frequently and there is no money for facilitators and lost time. The Curriculum Master Plan is no longer formally functional, but administrators say the philosophy of collaboration lives on, albeit in a less-formal and downscaled style. Relationships between the union and the district have remained steady, even as staff cutbacks were taking place. School officials are working to maintain the new way of doing things notwithstanding the financial difficulties.

Contact: Assistant Superintendent for Personnel and Employee Relations, ABC Unified Schools, 16700 Norwalk Blvd., Cerritos, CA 09701, (213) 926-5566.

Pittsburgh, PA: Teacher Professionalism Project

In 1985, the Pittsburgh school board and the AFT local reached agreement on a new two-year contract, even though their old contract had a year to run! Into this cordial atmosphere was born the Teacher Professionalism Project (TPP), designed to bring teachers into policy-making in the Pittsburgh schools, where 3,100 teachers serve 40,000 students. TPP

broadens instructional leadership opportunities for teachers without requiring them to give up teaching. The project has a 17-member steering committee and 11 subcommittees. Decisions are the product of consensus. They range from selecting teacher leaders for all grades to establishing qualifications for instructional teachers to planning and implementing new hiring and recruitment programs. Following recent contract negotiations, several changes have been made in the program, giving it permanence and broadening its steering committee to include the president of the PTA and four additional teachers and administrators.

Contact: Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools, 341 S. Bellefield Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15213, (412) 622-3770.

Altoona, PA: Using Consultants to Decentralize

In the aftermath of the Carnegie report, the head of Altoona's teachers' association (an NEA affiliate) and the superintendent of the schools agreed to look for a mechanism for involving teachers more in school decisions. An outside consulting firm was hired to put together a leadership structure district-wide and to help plan school committees to consider academic issues and approaches.

The steering committee is made up of a school board member, the president and past-president of the teachers' association, a regional representative of the association, elementary and secondary school administrators and the superintendent. Altoona is an industrial area with 9,200 students and 500 teachers. The district extends out from the city into small townships and rural areas.

The school district has committed to train every administrator and teacher over the next two years as part of its effort to encourage more school-based control. The training has helped relieve tension among administrators who were fearful of change, and has helped convince teachers that the effort is real. The program is still in its early stages.

Contact: Superintendent, Altoona Area School District, Fifth Ave. and 15th St., Altoona, PA 16602, (814) 946-8201.

Toledo, OH: Teachers Helping Teachers

Toledo is a center of heavy industry, and unions traditionally have been strong there. The school system has some 43,000 students and 2,300 teachers.

In 1981, the school board and the AFT local set in motion a bold teacher intern and intervention program in which teacher mentors are taking responsibility for orienting and training entry-level teachers, and for improving the performance of teachers who have difficulties doing their jobs. Peer consultants can spend up to 26 hours in the classroom observing teachers and providing remedial advice.

Contact: Superintendent, Toledo Independent School District, Manhattan and Elm Sts., Toledo, OH 43208, (419) 729-8231.

Richardson, TX: Site-based Management

Decentralized decision-making in the Dallas suburb of Richardson has involved teachers heavily in planning at both the central district and campus levels for many years. A large percentage of the teachers are involved in planning activity beyond the scope of their own classrooms. Richardson, with 2,020 teachers and 32,000 students, has been implementing practices from effective schools research in an effort to give staff more authority and bring decision-making down to the school building. The push for change has flowed from the top, with top administrators believing that the shift improves the quality of the decisions and the process. There is no collective bargaining. Teachers are represented by the local Richardson Education Association.

Richardson also has developed a leadership academy for the training and development of administrators and master teachers. Through site-based management, teachers on each campus serve on core planning groups along with parents and administrators to develop school plans. Budget planning that directly affects each school is also the primary responsibility of that particular school's core committee. Committee members are trained in how to use strategic planning models. All members of each school's neighborhood, including parents, are invited to play a role in creating the vision for that particular school.

Contact: Superintendent, Richardson Independent School District, 400 S. Greenville, Richardson, TX 75081, (214) 238-8111.

State-Level Programs

Although the emphasis in the Commission's work and in the communications programs cited in this report has been on local school district activity, many states have implemented one or more of the four strategies as pilot projects to stimulate improved collaboration in decision-making.

California's Policy Trust Agreements (Decentralized Decision-making)

A one-year state-directed pilot project taking place among six school districts in California should help determine whether reform proposals to strengthen the status and responsibility of teachers can succeed outside contract negotiations. A joint effort is underway by the California School Boards Association and the California

Federation of Teachers to study different models for bringing on change.

Trust agreements are not considered a substitute for collective bargaining, but rather are a process enabling management and union leaders to work together towards improving student instruction. The language of collective bargaining agreements covers problems that might arise but sometimes serves to limit school experimentation, while trust agreements are supposed to bridge the gap between a standard contract provision and educational innovation, without injuring either party to the contract. In general, contracts establish work rules and grievance procedures, while trust agreements supplement them with work goals and procedures for executing changes. School districts involved in the process include San Francisco, Lompoc, Newport-Mesa, Petaluma, Poway and Santa Cruz. It concludes in September 1988, with a formal evaluation to follow. The program is underwritten by an $87,000 grant from the Stuart Foundations.

The six pilot districts are currently moving ahead with innovative trust agreements. Examples include Poway's peer review program that has been initiated for all new elementary teachers in the district. In Petaluma, a staff development program has been planned and implemented completely by teachers. In addition, Petaluma is working toward a complete evaluation system including the superintendent's evaluation by teachers.

New Jersey's Cooperative Relations (Decentralized Decision-making)

New Jersey's State Board of Education has developed a pilot program of participatory management in local districts, called the Cooperative Relations Project. It was formed in response to Governor Thomas H. Kean's recent call for the creation of more productive relationships in school districts among school staff, administrators and school board members.

The Cooperative Relations Project is in its first year and will extend through 1992. Nine school districts are working with state education department staff and consultants to examine ways to increase involvement of the school staff in making important work-related decisions. According to the state department of education, this effort requires trust and collaboration involving the entire education community. The purposes of the Cooperative Relations Project are to:

- Increase teachers' roles in decisions that affect the classroom.
- Help boards and administrators identify ways to enhance teachers' work environment.
- Help teachers, administrators and school board members work together to improve the work environment as well as the conditions that affect the learning of the students.
- Assist districts and their schools in developing a process and related set of group procedures, as well as raising individual skills so they can continue the cooperative problem-solving process independently.
- Develop a set of standard procedures that other school districts can use themselves.

The Cooperative Relations Project is in two phases: on the district level for 1987-88 and 1988-89, and instituting problem-solving committees and related procedures at the school level beginning in 1989-90 and continuing through 1992.

New Jersey has collective bargaining for teachers. The state's new pilot project grew in part as a way to avoid an adversarial relationship between the teachers and school boards. Teachers believed they were not able to participate in developing significant policies such as selecting instructional materials, administering student discipline and devising the grading system.

Virginia's Increased Teacher Involvement (Decentralized Decision-making)

Virginia does not have collective bargaining for teachers, but the current school year began with new processes designed to increase teacher involvement in planning, decision-making and school and community relations. These developments were part of the "Standards for Accrediting Schools in Virginia" that the state board of education adopted last year. Processes to increase teacher involvement include:

- Making staff responsible for using the community's resources, involving parents and other community leaders in evaluating the school programs and developing a two-year school plan.
- Having the school staff and community representatives review every two years the philosophy and objectives of the school, as well as suggesting revisions.

The state also is working to improve communications by establishing the Virginia Academy for School Leaders. Funded through the state superintendent of public instruction's discretionary fund, the academy last fall began offering classes of three-and-a-half days for superintendents, with special reference to their relations with school board members. Two nationally recognized research and development organizations were involved in the classes for superintendents, which included activities such as role-playing, simulation and problem-solving.

Minnesota's State-level Labor-management Committee (Decentraliaed Decision-Making)

Minnesota has created the first state-level school labor-management com-

mittee, based on funding approved in October 1985 by a Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service grant. The North Star State's labor-management committee established 20 local school district labor-management committees, which build teams in each school building to develop and implement an education effectiveness plan to improve curriculum and instruction.

Massachusetts' REACH and School Improvement Councils (Advisory Communications and Teacher Recognition and Professional Development)

In Massachusetts there are two components involved in the state's Public School Improvement Act of 1985—REACH (Rewarding Educational Achievement) and School Improvement Councils, which provide the foundation for long-term educational improvements in the state's public schools.

Thousands of teachers across the state have benefited from opportunities to design and carry out programs that use and reward their abilities by designating them "Horace Mann Teachers," a distinction which adds $2,500 to their pay level. More financial improvements have been implemented by raising the minimum salary in 120 communities to $18,000. Ninety-eight percent of the state's teachers are above that minimum. Another $51 million in state assistance has helped supplement teacher salaries and provided for professional development grants.

While financial remuneration for teachers, principals, building staff, schools and school districts is derived from REACH, there also is increased communication in school districts through the state's School Improvement Councils. In two years, nearly 1,800 of these councils have been established and are making contributions at the local levels, with teachers, administrators, parents and students all involved.

Pennsylvania's Comprehensive Schools Cooperation Committee (Alternative Negotiating Techniques and Teacher Recognition and Professional Development)

Governor Robert P. Casey formed a Schools Cooperation Committee to examine ways to improve labor relations in the state public school system. Chaired by Labor Secretary Harris Wofford, the committee included representation from the Pennsylvania School Boards Association, Pennsylvania School Administrators Association, Pennsylvania Elementary and Secondary Principals Association, Pennsylvania School Business Officials Association, Pennsylvania State Education Association and Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers.

Committee members in November 1987 submitted proposals to Wofford on ways to improve labor relations in the schools. The committee is preparing a publication for in-service education of school employees, so that ideas the representatives submit can be applied in school districts around the state.

Maryland's Annual Statewide Conference (Advisory Communications)

The Maryland State Board of Education is working to open communications in the state's education community by hosting two meetings a year for leaders of the state's key educational organizations. For several years, the state has held annual statewide conferences of local superintendents, school board members, central office administrators, school-based administrators and teachers. The meetings have been successful in bringing together the state's education community.

The new format of two meetings a year will, it is hoped, improve communications even more. In December, the state board of education held the first of two meetings a year under its new format. The state board intends to keep up its communications efforts, improve them and work on other ways of reducing rivalry and promoting mutual cooperation.

New Hampshire's School Improvement Project Action Plan (Decentralized Decision-making)

Stressing collaboration for school improvement, the New Hampshire School Improvement Project Action Plan began on April 1, 1988, centered in 15 schools. The plan emphasizes administrator development through on-site school improvement and calls for comprehensive participation by administrators, school board members, parents, teachers and community leaders. Participating schools will be involved in the rationale and techniques for school-based management.

South Carolina's EIA Implementation Councils (Advisory Communications)

South Carolina, a state which does not allow collective bargaining for teachers, has been working successfully with Implementation Councils at the school, district and regional levels to improve working conditions for teachers. The councils grew out of the state's Education Improvement Act of 1984 and serve as conduits for concerns and suggestions about problems facing schools and districts—from salaries to tuition reimbursement and other benefits to school construction.

Implementation Councils serve as forums to make known needs and concerns which then are sent forward to state-level committees for study and recommendations for action. At first, the Implementation Councils were strictly limited to areas outlined in the Education Improvement Act. The scope of the councils' activities has expanded, however, to include any public school-related issue. What makes the Implementation Councils effective is the attendance mix at the

meetings: teachers, administrators and a cross-section of the community. The councils became effective and structured meeting places for the communication of ideas in a nonadversarial way.

Local school districts use teacher advisory councils, or "superintendent's cabinets," made up of teachers to gather and distribute information and to encourage the exchange of ideas and concerns.

Regional council meetings are attended by district representatives, who may include superintendents, teachers and school board members.

. . .

While lengthy, this catalogue of programs-in-progress only scratches the surface. It doesn't begin to tell the whole story of innovation in the public schools. Efforts to find new ways to enhance communications in public schools are ongoing in every state, invigorated in many places by the recent reform reports. State school boards associations are a logical place to look for additional information on innovations underway in a particular state or region.

The NSBA staff has attempted to contact representatives of all parties involved in the listed projects, but the necessarily brief descriptions omit details that are needed to make a program adaptable. The Commission urges local school officials considering the adaptation of a program listed here to contact the district involved and ask for further information. ■

The construction of a profession, through the improvement of professional education, the development of a differentiated structure for professional opportunity, the creation of standards for entry, and the creation of settings for mutual exchange between research and practice, will have profound effects on the competence and aspirations of new teachers. . . .

—Tommorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group

CHAPTER IV
SCHOOL BOARDS AND CHANGE:
Coping with the consequences

Helping ordinary schools become great schools is not an easy job. Enthusiasm is important, but it's not enough. New Hampshire school principal Dennis Littky and ex-principal turned consultant Robby Fried have identified what they call the "dirty dozen"—enemies of change that are at work in most school districts:

1. Champions of inertia—the bureaucrats and sometimes the board members who sanctify the way things always have been.

2. State legislators who first denounce the system because it isn't working well, and then demand more of it.

3. Trench-diggers—prophets of self-protection at every level who dig in their heels to maintain their status, at any cost.

4. Glad-handing administrators who speak boldly of reform while working quietly to scuttle it.

5. Tyrants of the teachers' lounges—most schools have at least one: naysayers who sound off over the coffee cups and the clack of the copier machine, reinforcing administrators who've always said that teachers can't be trusted to work together for constructive change.

6. Pinch-penny school board members who blame teachers and principals for school non-performance and then whack funds for professional development.

7. People who hate kids. Let's face it, although most of us were young once, this country alternates between worshipping youth and fearing or denouncing young people.

8. Technical prima donnas—central office specialists who speak a language all their own, and who want to impose materials and procedures from the top down, at any cost.

9. Panacea hucksters—the textbook sellers, consultants and peddlers of models and solutions that are "teacher-proof."

10. Test-score addicts who believe that the numbers tell the whole story, and thus advocate teaching to the test while devaluing the kind of learning that can't be easily quantified.

11. Power-mongers—the program chiefs and department heads who exclude everyone else from decision-making, and who make their decisions in splendid isolation from their impact on other aspects of the school program.

12. Managerial myopics—administrators and personnel chieftains who refuse to consider hiring applicants who have other than traditional educational backgrounds, depriving schools of new perspectives.

Each of America's 97,000 local school board members certainly will recognize some, if not all, of these characters in the context of the more than 15,000 local districts in the United States. But if ferreting out and reforming or eliminating these demons were all it took, most school districts could be well on their way to excellence. The truth is, there are other broad and difficult bumps that must be paved over as school districts search for roads to improvement.

Costs of Reform Can Be High

To begin with, reform can be expensive, at least in the short run, but provide a high return. Any process of communications used to discuss changes with teachers and administrators has to sensitize all parties to the need to keep school district costs from skyrocketing. Governors and state legislatures that have been part of the cry for new approaches must now face the financial realities that may accompany plans for change. The Carnegie Task Force estimates that the incremental costs of funding its reform package would require an average annual real increase of resources of nearly 3 percent a year for a period of 10 years, above current levels of spending growth. Formal and informal discussions with teachers and administrators should be frank in their assessment of what is possible, given the resources available.

With costs likely to go up, the public's perception of what's going on becomes critical. School officials need to be prepared well in advance of any move toward decentralization or restructuring to lay out the case for it in such a way as to ensure public understanding and support. That means thinking through every aspect of the reform proposals carefully, discarding those aspects that have no relevance to the community and then figuring out how best to handle and promote the others.

One way to broaden community commitment to new approaches can be through the creation of local citizen advisory bodies to work with the school board, and collegial committees drawn from the staff, to review and embrace the changes that the board and administration are prepared to implement. Another can simply be through a heightened public information and education effort, using local media and, especially, parents' organizations in the schools to lay out what is ahead. The task is a delicate one that requires simultaneous support and applause for the successes of today while making the case for revisions that will lead to an even better tomorrow.

Shifts in Authority

An obvious point of concern that will need careful addressing is the changing role of administrators. If lead teachers or other senior teachers assume greater authority in the school, how is the role of the principal affected? If curriculum is to be drawn up largely at the school site, within parameters agreed upon by the superintendent, then what is the role of the central office staff curriculum people and those in the regions?

"Empowerment" is the word used so often in recent studies and articles by educators. Some school administrators are apt to feel that in a universe of limited "power," adding to one group's power surely takes away from another's. A case can be made, though, that power grows for all when it is shared. School leaders would be wise to avoid defining issues in power formulations and place the emphasis, instead, on collegial and cooperative activities that lead to a consensus within the school community about how best to tackle the problem at hand. If men and women who have served the system loyally perceive the reform program to be threatening, many will find ways to demonstrate that it won't work. School reforms must not be centered around eliminating staff positions and taking away authority; they must address ways to enable each teacher and school staff person to contribute effectively to his or her shared responsibility: educating the children.

Assessment and Adjustment

Another issue that local school officials must face early in the process of implementing changes is the need to assess and advertise success and to recognize and replace failure. In discussing the recent innovations established in Rochester, NY, a state official familiar with the program said one immediate result had been substantial growth in a nearby college's school of education. There is talk of university professors quitting to teach in the public schools.

But there is also a frank recognition by some who are watching the Rochester experiment that if it fails to produce measurable results over time, there will be a disillusioned public likely to turn away from supporting the public schools there. Careful communications both within the system and externally should enable the district to soften this "pass or fail" mentality as the program is fine-tuned over time.

In implementing new communications programs, school leaders must guard against disappointment by not allowing unrealistic expectations to be created, by insisting that experimental programs have sufficient time to play out and demonstrate their potential and by keeping the staff and the public informed of evaluations and adjustments that are taking place. It is important to try to recognize and correct failure in its earliest manifestations, but it is equally important not to eliminate a program prematurely when fine-tuning could be the answer.

In the relatively closed operations of a large private company, managers and workers come together every day in formal and informal ways to assess and modify the way things are done. Financial analysts and stockholders by and large don't look for the specific product of these daily adjustments. They keep their eyes on the bottom line.

Because the costs associated with change in the schools can be high, public acceptance and support for

new communications mechanisms and an uncharacteristic patience in awaiting results also are important. School boards face the complex and potentially conflicting responsibilities associated with maintaining standards and confidence in the schools as they are planning for and adopting new methods of communications designed ultimately to improve. Where public dissatisfaction with the schools is high, it doesn't necessarily follow that there will be great enthusiasm for communications reforms that are perceived as costly. To begin with, in the nation overall three out of four Americans have no direct involvement with the public school system except as taxpayers—a status many would happily give away. Thus, their experience and understanding of what really is taking place is limited and superficial, and their sources of information often are restricted to an occasional newspaper article reporting on the latest school system study or a TV report on an impending strike by teachers.

Disharmony within the system in a time of change can only be damaging. Thus, districts should use their bargaining processes or other communications structures and their public relations programs to try to make certain that all of the interest groups, those inside the schools and those watching from the outside, have the same understanding about what is to be attempted, and buy into it.

The best school programs still need regular evaluation and adjustment. Gauging and positively communicating these needs will always be the primary responsibility of the superintendent and staff with support and policy direction from the school board. As responsibility for day-to-day decision-making shifts to the school building, ultimate responsibility for the product stays where it always has been, with the school board. ■

Our final word . . . is that all segments of our population give attention to the implementation of our recommendations. Our present plight did not appear overnight, and the responsibility for our current situation is widespread. Reform of our educational system will take time and unwavering commitment . . . Help should come from students themselves, from parents, teachers, and school boards; from the colleges and universities; from the local, state and federal officials . . . It is their America and the America of all of us that is at risk. . . .

— A Nation At Risk

CHAPTER V
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A review of the works in progress, in an earlier chapter, contrasts starkly with the rather dark image of the schools conjured up by the quote at left. There is in many of the reform writings a despairing note, a tone that suggests all is lost.

Are the schools really in such grave danger, if such a wide array of interesting and valuable things are happening all over? Were the groups calling for reform overwrought by the cumulative disappointment that they uncovered, so much so that they missed the bright potential that exists in American schools too?

The Commission is aware of the shortcomings that exist in many school systems. It also is aware of the incredible demands placed on the schools over the decades and believes that the system has always responded to public need. The recommendations of the Commission are aimed at a practical purpose: assisting school board members and others with an interest in the schools in examining, evaluating and implementing collaborative partnerships that enhance communications within school districts and improve educational operations.

- *School boards should encourage new communications efforts as part of their thrust to improve local education.*

The national reform recommendations are a provocative starting point — but only a starting point — for new dialogues around what's right for local public schools. School boards are positioned to bring that discussion into the community by challenging the professionals in the schools to think out loud with them about what's right and what's wrong in the school district. The Commission is persuaded that schools should be moving to find mechanisms that allow shared decision making — but each district has to find its own best way.

In reaching out to interested parties, school officials should be taking the lead in a positive way, not defensively. For all of the hand-wringing about the state of public education, hundreds of thousands of individual young Americans are graduating from high school each year and going on to obtain the higher education they will need to lead the nation forward. The dropout rate remains alarmingly high, especially among minority youth, but it is also true that the dropout rate is lower as a percentage of national school enrollment than ever before. School boards should set a standard for communicating positively about the schools and challenge teachers and administrators, and their organizations, to promote equally positive views.

- *School boards should mobilize public interest and support for efforts to broaden participation in decision-making processes.*

The Commission is confident that within every local district lies the imagination, the energy and the intellectual resources necessary to build great schools. Among the teachers, parents, administrators, board members and other interested parties in every community, there is the potential for discovering that unique formula which will enable local education to fit the vision of those who want it. Local responses to the national "crisis" in the schools must be based not only on national findings and premises, but on local realities as well.

When school teachers and their unions call for greater involvement in deci-

sion-making by teachers, it's hardly novel, but when the school board speaks eloquently for shared decision-making and clear lines of accountability, it's news. School board members should work with administrators and teachers to develop a common message to the community about new collegial approaches to problem-solving in the schools.

Local responses must be drawn out of local understanding and consensus. That consensus can begin with better communications between teachers and the school district leadership, but it has to try to make room for everyone who wants to be part of the process, and then some.

An unfortunate fact of life in public education today is that the majority of adults in most communities have no contact with and only minimal interest in the schools. They are single, they are childless, they are parents of children grown and gone, they are commuters whose school interests are elsewhere or they are devoted to private or alternative schools and they care very little about what is happening with the public school down the street, built to serve them and their neighbors. They have no particular interest in improving the quality of local education. They want lower, not higher, taxes.

Some studies suggest that as much as 70 percent of the population falls in this category of people out of touch with public education. Given that starting point, it is important that the involved minority find a common set of goals and values for the schools and communicate in harmony about the schools in ways that will encourage others to care. When school board members fight among themselves, and when unions and boards dig themselves into trenches and honest disagreements lead toward Armageddon, the uninvolved majority is unlikely to find a new volunteer spirit.

- *School boards should build consensus mechanisms district-wide and in each school that allow flexibility in decision-making.*

As state legislatures move to impose standards from outside the district, school administrators and teaching professionals should be collaborating in finding local solutions. In this way, reform can take place one school at a time, with the needs of each particular institution met by those best situated to understand and respond.

Site-based innovation should be observed and evaluated by committees or teams of teachers and principals from other locations and materials and methods shared from school to school. A reasonable goal would be to have principal-teacher committees from each school linked into a district-wide network that shares information and develops common goals and positions for submission to the superintendent and the board.

- *School boards should accept and implement the concept that the best decisions are likely to result when those who will implement the decisions participate in the decision-making process. Final decisions must be consistent with applicable laws, regulations and board policies.*

The particular challenge to school districts will be to find a process that allows teachers a greater contribution to decision-making without dismantling the apparatus that keeps each school accountable to the children and their parents in the district. In promoting greater freedom for teachers in the classroom and more autonomy for each school within the system, the Commission is not suggesting that laws and policies in place be abrogated. Boards may want to give the superintendent authority to waive standard policies in the interest of experimentation, however, just as teachers' organizations may need to be flexible in the enforcement of collective bargaining provisions where they mitigate against experimentation in problem-solving.

- *School boards should initiate discussions with teachers and administrators about their greater involvement in decision-making. The approach will vary depending upon whether the school district is in a collective bargaining situation or not. But the overall focus will be similar: involving administrators and teachers closely in the formulation of education policy.*

The Commission examined several districts where union-management discussions had led to bold new initiatives. The two major national teachers' organizations have moved forward to advocate for their members greater decision-making autonomy and the creation of a more professional work environment. Clearly, existing collective bargaining committees and forums offer a structure for the discussion of curriculum changes, the formulation of new school management ideas and other instructional issues.

A school district certainly does not need to replicate collective bargaining or recognize a union, however, to move toward decentralization. School boards should initiate discussions with teachers and administrators and encourage their involvement, but should strive to develop communications structures that include broad representation of teaching professionals, selected by the teachers and principals with whom they work.

- *School boards should build trust and communicate confidence in the schools, and approach change in a positive manner.*

The essence of the various national education reports with their calls for change gives boards and school officials considerable license to promote change within their communities. District officials need not paint a picture of failure and imminent doom, but rather can build upon existing support for the schools by creating community-wide mechanisms for discerning the needs of the schools and addressing them. Those mechanisms should strive to reflect the entire community of citizens concerned about the schools – including teachers and other staff, parents and students, business leaders and taxpayers.

Information-sharing and consensus-building within the schools are first steps that many districts already have begun and that nearly every district can accomplish with sufficient effort. Changes in school operations should be communicated clearly, and no change should be implemented unless a purpose can be easily articulated, a time frame agreed upon and a method of evaluation developed. Guarantees against failure and disappointment are hard to find, but constant evaluation and refinement is the next best alternative. Teachers and administrators who propose change should be given every opportunity to make the case for it, but also should be required regularly to demonstrate that the new process works.

• • •

This report has stressed the need for improving communications in public school operations by opening up decision-making and welcoming greater participation by teachers and administrators in those judgments that directly affect their lives in the classrooms. It grew out of the view that improving communications would help lead to improved schools.

The Commission is hopeful that implementation of these ideas, tailored to fit the unique circumstances of each community, will help narrow the distance between national and state calls for education reform and the practical realities of local school operations. ■

APPENDIX A
EDUCATION REFORM REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

As part of its study leading to the report on improved communications in public school educational operations, the NSBA Commission reviewed several major national reports on the need for improvement in America's public schools. The highlights of each report are summarized here.

A Nation at Risk

Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983.

Probably no report on education in this century has so stirred those responsible for education in the United States. The report acknowledged a widespread perception that something had gone wrong in American schooling and assessed the quality of teaching in the United States in comparison with the processes of other industrial societies.

Created by Education Secretary T. H. Bell in the summer of 1981, the 18-member Commission included university scholars, state education officials, a former governor, teachers and administrators and one school board member, the then-president of NSBA. The purpose of the report, according to the Commission, was "to generate reform of our educational system in fundamental ways and to renew the nation's commitment to schools and colleges of high quality throughout the length and breadth of our land."

It found that the content of secondary school curricula had been watered down by excessive allowances for student choice, and that many students moved through the system without enough concentration on core subjects such as English, science, math and languages. This report said that the professional worklife and rewards for teachers were not attractive to promising and academically able college students, so that teachers were being drawn from the lower end of graduation lists.

The report said school districts should enforce effective use of the existing school day or consider a longer school day or year. It made seven recommendations for improving teaching:

- Raise the competence level of teachers.
- Increase salaries and make them market sensitive and performance-based.
- Implement 11-month teacher contracts.
- Develop career ladders that distinguish between beginning instructors, experienced teachers and outstanding "master teachers."
- Bring in professionals from outside the teaching profession to remedy teacher shortages in math and science.
- Create financial incentives to attract top students into teaching.
- Involve experienced teachers in designing teacher preparation programs and in teacher supervision.
- Provide administrators with the resources for career development to assure that they are strong leaders and managers.

The Commission called for greater citizen involvement and fiscal support for the schools. It said principals and superintendents must build community support for reform, and school boards must offer professional development and other support for teachers. It said state and local school officials should share responsibility for financing and governing the schools and bringing on the recommended reforms, while the federal government should continue to help meet special needs of key groups of students and support and supplement local and state efforts without intruding or adding administrative burdens.

A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century

Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession of the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.

This report asserts that "America's ability to compete in world markets is eroding," and calls for a major restructuring of the educational system. "We believe it must be rebuilt to match the drastic change needed in our economy if we are to prepare our children for productive lives in the 21st Century," the report says.

The report notes that in the period since the publication of *A Nation at Risk*, "the American people have made a good beginning in the search for an educational renaissance," but goes on to say that the nation must acknowledge "two essential truths: first, that success depends on achieving far more demanding educational standards than we have ever attempted to reach before, and second, that the key to success lies in creating a profession equal to the task—a profession of well-educated teachers prepared to assume new powers and responsibilities to redesign schools for the future."

The task force called for sweeping changes in public policy on education, including:

- Creating a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, organized with a regional and state membership structure, to establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet those standards.

- Restructuring the teaching force and introducing a new category of "lead teachers" with the proven ability to provide active leadership in redesigning the schools and in helping their colleagues uphold high standards of learning and teaching.
- Requiring a Bachelor's degree in the arts and sciences as a prerequisite for the professional study of teaching.
- Developing a new professional curriculum in graduate schools of education leading to a Master in Teaching degree, based on systematic knowledge of teaching and including internships and residencies in the schools.
- Mobilizing the nation's resources to prepare minority youngsters for teaching careers.
- Relating incentives for teachers to school-wide student performance and providing schools with the technology, services and staff essential to teacher productivity.
- Making teachers' salaries and career opportunities competitive with those in other professions.

Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education

Produced by the National Governors' Association, chaired by Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, with Governors Bill Clinton of Arkansas and Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey co-chairmen, 1986.

In the report's opening statement, Governor Alexander asserts: "The governors are ready to provide the leadership needed to get results on the hard issues that confront the better schools movement. We are ready to lead the second wave of reform in American public education."

In a Socratic style, the governors posed what they called "tough questions that must be answered" about education in the U.S. Among them:

- Why not pay teachers more for teaching well?
- What can be done to attract, train and reward excellent school leaders?
- Why not let parents choose the schools their children attend?
- Aren't there ways to help poor children with weak preparation succeed in school?
- Why are expensive school buildings closed half the year when children are behind in their studies and many classrooms are overcrowded?
- Why shouldn't schools be using the newest technologies for learning?

The governors said they placed special emphasis on the needs of education because education accounts for a rising proportion of most state budgets and because there is a clear connection between better schools and the ability of the states to compete economically.

Governor Kean chaired the Task Force on Teaching, which made these recommendations for the states:

- Convene a panel to review the national teacher policy reports.
- Support creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards.
- Develop state initiatives to encourage professional school environments.
- Challenge the higher education community to rebuild the system of teacher education.
- Build the case for sustained real-dollar increases in education spending.
- Define and put in place a comprehensive teacher recruitment strategy to recruit able teachers.
- Announce the end of emergency teaching licenses—and make it stick.
- Recognize outstanding teaching.

To attract good teachers, the task force said, states should:

- Define the body of professional knowledge and practice that teachers need.
- Help create a national board to define teacher standards.
- Rebuild the system of teacher education.
- Redesign the organization of schools to create more productive working and learning environments.
- Redesign the structure of the teaching career.
- Recruit able teacher candidates.
- Improve teacher compensation at all levels, and align teacher incentives with school-wide student performance.
- Improve teacher mobility.
- Establish a "loose/tight" approach to state and local regulation of schools.

The governors proposed that states be prepared to "take over" the running of school districts deemed to be "educationally bankrupt," while permitting regulatory flexibility for districts that exceed standards of achievement.

Tomorrow's Teachers

Report of the Holmes Group of teacher college deans and educators, 1986.

This report called for a fresh look at the form and quality of teacher education in America, and urged the following specific teacher education changes:

- Make schools better places for motivated teachers to work and learn.
- Develop exemplary models for new divisions of authority among teachers and administrators.
- Recognize differences in the skills, experience and commitment of teachers and create a three-level teacher professional structure with more autonomy given to those best qualified and experienced.

What Works: Research About Teaching and Learning

Report of the U. S. Department of Education, 1986.

Secretary William Bennett called this document "the most important report on education since *A Nation at Risk*." Its findings include these:

- Parental involvement helps children learn, and so teachers must work harder at involving parents.
- Teachers who communicate high expectations obtain greater academic performance from students than teachers who do not.
- The more time students devote to learning the greater the likelihood of achievement. The amount of time available for learning in school is determined by the instructional and management skills of the teacher and priorities set by the school administration.
- Students learn more when teachers explain clearly what students are expected to learn and demonstrate the steps needed to accomplish a particular task.
- Frequent and systematic monitoring of students' progress helps identify the strengths and weaknesses in their learning and in the instruction they are receiving.
- Crucial ingredients for effective schools are strong instructional leadership, an orderly environment, school-wide emphasis on basic skills, high teacher expectations for students and continuous assessment.

What Next? More Leverage for Teachers

Report of the Education Commission of the States, 1986.

The report is actually a compendium of views by several scholars and not a consensus report from ECS. The scholars were interviewed separately, but agreed on several key points:

- Current policies may not work if they fail to consider the human side of institutions, if they centralize or decentralize irresponsibly and if they are too specific or piecemeal.
- Redefining the teaching profession includes restructuring how teachers learn to be teachers, improving working conditions for teachers and making teaching more like other professions.
- Other things, such as giving teachers control over time and materials, are more important than money in reforming education.

Ventures in Good Schooling

Joint publication of the National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1986.

Ventures is designed to be a "blueprint" for improvement, providing specific recommendations in six crucial aspects of secondary education: purpose and goals of the school; school organization and climate; classroom instruction; supervision, evaluation and personnel development; student achievement and behavior; and family and community relations.

Among the report's recommended criteria for a successful secondary school:

- The principals and teachers, working together, define the expectations and outcomes sought by the school. This task is accomplished within the policy guidelines set forth in state and district policies. The emphasis is on the hands-together approach to the task by the principal and the teachers.
- The principal and teachers together generate a strong sense of community and interdependence. Together, they share a commitment to high expectations for their students, instructional excellence and a climate of professionalism.
- The principal and teachers focus on strategies and procedures that promote effective classroom instruction. Collaboration in zeroing in on improvement of the instructional program is the essence of this indicator. The principal builds a climate for experimentation and encourages risk-taking by teachers.
- The principal and teachers develop a counseling and performance evaluation plan for teachers that is designed to maintain and improve the instructional program. Job evaluation is accepted as a necessity in the school, and extends to the evaluation of the principal by the teachers.
- The principal and teachers develop and maintain a variety of cooperative links with the community in recognition that family and community involvement and support complement the efforts of the school. ■

APPENDIX B
GETTING STARTED: FUNDING SOURCES

School districts rarely have enough money—indeed, enough money probably doesn't exist—to do everything that is right and needed and still be able to experiment with new structures and ideas.

The proponents of large-scale revamping of the way the schools deliver their product admit that change will cost money. Some contend that the costs can be softened by other economies, but in the short-term there are expenses, and school districts live in the short-term.

Nevertheless, many districts have found sources of revenue outside the usual tax stream for attempting innovations in school management. Foundations, and some government agencies as well, are receptive to proposals for special projects. A partial list of those sources follows:

PUBLIC-SECTOR FUNDING SOURCES

Federal

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
2100 K St., N.W.
Washington, DC 20427
(202) 653-5300
Contact: Director

This agency assists labor and management representatives to resolve disputes through collective bargaining, mediation and voluntary arbitration. It awards a limited number of small grants for labor-management cooperation.

State

Office of Labor-Management Cooperation
Department of Commerce and Community Affairs
620 East Adams
Springfield, IL 62701
(217) 785-6284
Contact: Manager

The Illinois Labor-Management Program was originally established as an economic development activity to improve relations between labor and management. One element of the program has been to set up Area Labor-Management Committees to maintain open lines of communication. The Labor-Management Program gives out grants to establish and maintain the committees. By resolving problems throughout the year, the creators hoped to create a more accommodating climate at contract negotiations. The Labor-Management Committees have been mainly used in the industrial sector of the economy, but they are starting to develop in the public sector. In a related development, the Labor-Management Cooperation Committee is in its early stage of existence. The creators of the committee plan to set up subcommittees, one of which will deal with the public sector.

Bureau of Mediation Services
1380 Energy La., Suite 2
St. Paul, MN 55108
(612) 649-5421
Contact: Commissioner

The Bureau of Mediation Services in Minnesota has established a School District Labor Management Committee. The committee avoids subjects relating to collective bargaining and grievance procedures, but it does have the authority to resolve in-building problems. The purpose of the committees is to find answers to problems throughout the year, so that the collective bargaining process is less adversarial.

Office of Labor-Management Cooperation
P.O. Box 1001
Columbus, OH 43266
(614) 644-8758
Contact: Manager

Within school districts, the agency seeks to change the ongoing relationship between school districts and teachers by addressing problems as they occur. By resolving problems as they arise, labor negotiations are less confrontational and adversarial.

Pennsylvania MILRITE Council
Finance Building, Room 513
Harrisburg, PA 17120
(717) 783-7408
Contact: Executive Director

The state of Pennsylvania has established Labor-Management Committees for the public and private sectors. The purpose of these committees is to address important work site conditions that are outside the collective-bargaining process and grievance procedure. By maintaining open lines of communication between labor and management, thereby eliminating sources of conflict, the committees seek to create an improved climate for collective bargaining and resolving grievances.

PRIVATE-SECTOR FUNDING SOURCES

The following foundations offer grants in the field of education. The reader should be aware that many of the foundations listed here fund projects within a restricted geographical area.

Nation-wide Giving

Primerica Foundation
American La., P.O. Box 3610
Greenwich, CT 06830-3610
(203) 552-2148
Contact: Manager

Education, especially secondary education, is one area of activity for this foundation. Generally, the foundation funds local projects whose results would be useful on a national scale. It gives to organizations in areas where it has facilities. Grant recipients receive financial assistance.

The Stone Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 1100
Southport, CT 06490
(203) 254-2200
Contact: Secretary/Treasurer

This foundation is primarily interested in unique projects and programs, and education is one particular area of interest. Recipient receives seed money. Giving is conducted on a nation-wide basis.

Matsushita Foundation
One Panasonic Way
Secaucus, NJ 07094
(201) 392-4131
Contact: Executive Director

The foundation has funded "school improvement" programs to restructure school districts. Grant recipients receive seed money and technical assistance. Grant giving is conducted on a nation-wide basis.

Carnegie Foundation of New York
437 Madison Ave.
New York, NY 10022
(212) 371-3200
Contact: Secretary

One of the program areas of the foundation is Special Projects. The purpose of these grants is to explore new ideas and to strengthen the nonprofit sector. The foundation funds projects nation-wide.

Ford Foundation
320 East 43rd St.
New York, NY 10017
(212) 573-5000
Contact: Vice President

This foundation gives grants for experimental and demonstration projects to improve secondary education, among its many activities. Grant recipients receive financial and technical assistance for special projects. Giving is conducted on a nation-wide basis.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10104
(212) 373-4200
Contact: Secretary

The nonprofit sector is one of the fund's major grant recipients. Grants to the nonprofit sector seek, among other things, to promote the health and vitality of that sector, and to improve management practices. The foundation funds projects nation-wide.

Kettering Family Foundation
2400 Kettering Tower
Dayton, OH 45423
(513) 228-1021
Contact: Secretary

Education is a field of interest to this foundation. The foundation is currently funding a project in Johnson City, TX, where representatives from all levels of management have input into the policy-making process. Grant recipients receive financial assistance for special projects. Grant giving is conducted on a nation-wide basis.

Regional Giving

ARCO Foundation
515 South Flower St.
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 486-3342
Contact: Program Officer

Public primary and secondary education has become an area of interest to this foundation. Grant recipients receive seed money. Giving is limited to Alaska, Arizona, California, Nevada, Oregon, Texas and Washington.

Wallace Alexander Gerbode Foundation
470 Columbus Ave., Suite 209
San Francisco, CA 94113
(415) 391-0911
Contact: Executive Director

This foundation supports innovative programs in education. It provides consulting services and technical assistance. Giving is primarily for programs directly affecting residents of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco and San Mateo counties, CA; Hawaii and, occasionally, other northern California counties.

Walter S. Johnson Foundation
525 Middlefield Rd., Suite 110
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(415) 326-0485
Contact: Project Officer

Public education is the sole field of interest to this foundation. The foundation provides seed money and technical assistance for research. Giving is primarily in Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, CA, and Washoe County, NV.

Louis R. Lurie Foundation
535 California Street, Suite 5100
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 392-2470
Contact: President

The Lurie Foundation funds research projects relating to secondary education. Consulting services are available for grant recipients. Giving is limited to the San Francisco Bay area and the Chicago metropolitan area.

The David and Lucile Packard Foundation
300 Second St., Suite 200
Los Altos, CA 94022
(415) 948-7658
Contact: Executive Director

The Packard Foundation makes available consulting services, technical assistance, and seed money for research projects in education. Giving is mainly in San Francisco and Monterey Bay, CA, and some grants are available in the Pueblo, CO area.

The Frost Foundation, Ltd.
Cherry Creek Plaza II, Suite 810
650 South Cherry St.
Denver, CO 80222
(303) 388-1687
Contact: Executive Director

The foundation provides seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for research in education. Giving is primarily in the southwestern United States.

Greater Ashland Area Cultural and Economic Development Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 2096
Ashland, KY 41105-2096
(606) 324-3888
Contact: Executive Director

The foundation gives grants in the tri-state area of Ashland, KY; Ironton, OH; and Huntington, WV, for educational purposes. It provides seed money, consulting services and technical assistance.

George I. Alden Trust
370 Main St., Suite 1250
Worcester, MA 01608
(617) 757-9243
Contact: Chairman

Grants to promote education are one area of activity of this organization. Secondary education and educational associations received 14 percent of total trust disbursements in 1985. The trust provides seed money for the research. Giving is primarily in the Northeast, with an emphasis on Worcester, MA.

The Danforth Foundation
231 South Bemiston Ave.
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 862-6200
Contact: President

Through grants and program activities, this foundation funds projects in metropolitan areas that improve the quality of teaching and learning. It is especially interested in funding activities for administrators who are formulating public policy on elementary and secondary public education.

Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Inc.
102 Reynolda Village
Winston-Salem, NC 27106-5123
(919) 748-9222
Contact: Executive Director

Almost a third (32 percent) of grants in the 1985 fiscal year went to educational institutions or educational advocacy groups. One grant in particular in 1985 went to an effective school project in New Orleans. Giving is primarily in North Carolina and the southeastern United States and to national organizations.

Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation
1400 Benedum-Trees Building
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
(412) 288-0360
Contact: Executive Vice President

Education is one area where this foundation gives grants. It generally gives grants for establishing demonstration projects with replication potential in West Virginia. The foundation provides consulting services, technical assistance and seed money for special projects. Giving is limited to WV and the greater Pittsburgh, PA area.

Patrick and Anna M. Cudahy Fund
P.O. Box 11978
Milwaukee, WI 53211
(414) 962-6820
Contact: Administrator

Education is one field supported by this foundation. Grant recipients receive seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for research and special projects. Giving is mainly in Milwaukee, WI, Chicago, IL, and to national programs.

State-wide or Intra-state Giving

M. W. Smith, Jr. Foundation
P.O. Box 691
Daphne, AL 36526
(205) 626-5436
Contact: Secretary

Education is one of the activities to which this foundation gives grants. Support given to recipients includes seed money for research and special projects. Giving is mainly in southwest AL.

Tucson Community Foundation
6842 East Tanque Verde
Tucson, AZ 85715
(602) 772-1707
Contact: Executive Director

Education is one of the main beneficiaries of grants from this foundation. Grant recipients receive seed money and special assistance. Giving is limited to the Tucson, AZ metropolitan area.

The Ross Foundation
P.O. Box 335
Arkadelphia, AR 71923
(501) 246-9881
Contact: President

Provides seed money and consulting services, among other support. Giving is limited to Arkadelphia and Clark County, AR.

The Winthrop Foundation
308 East 8th Street
Little Rock, AR 72202
(501) 376-6854
Contact: President

This foundation supports local projects which, among other things, improve the delivery of services and the administrative capacity of institutions, increase participation of people in the decision-making process in education and improve institutions serving the community. The foundation provides seed money and consulting services. Giving is primarily in AR or projects benefiting AR.

The Clorox Company Foundation
1221 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 271-7747
Contact: Contributions Administrator

Education receives many grants from this foundation. Grant recipients receive technical assistance. Giving is mainly in Oakland, CA and other areas of company operations.

The Corcoran Community Foundation
P.O. Box 655
Corcoran, CA 93212
(209) 992-5551
Contact: Executive Director

The foundation provides consulting services and technical assistance,

among other forms of suppport. Giving is primarily in the Corcoran, CA area.

The Mary A. Crocker Trust
233 Post St., 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 982-0139
Contact: Administrator

This foundation gives priority to creative and innovative programs in education, among other activity areas. Support received includes seed money. Giving is primarily in the San Francisco Bay Area, CA.

The Julio R. Gallo Foundation
P.O. Box 1130
Modesto, CA 95353
(209) 579-3373
Contact: Vice President

The emphasis of this foundation is on education. Giving is mainly in CA.

Community Foundation for Monterey County
P.O. Box 1384
Monterey, CA 93942
(408) 375-9712
Contact: Executive Director

The foundation provides seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for special projects and research in education. Giving is primarily in Monterey County, CA.

San Diego Community Foundation
525 B St., Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 239-8815
Contact: Executive Director or Project Officer

Education is one area where this foundation gives grants. Recipients receive seed money for projects. Giving is limited to San Diego County, CA.

Greater Santa Cruz County Community Foundation
820 Bay Ave.
Capitola, CA 95010
(408) 479-0505
Contact: Executive Director

This foundation provides seed money, technical assistance, and consulting services for special projects in education. Giving is limited to Santa Cruz, CA.

Stuart Foundations
601 California St., Suite 1104
San Francisco, CA 94108
(415) 982-1144
Contact: Vice President

The foundation has funded projects which restructure school systems by providing greater teacher participation. Another area of interest is alternatives to collective bargaining. Grant recipients receive financial support. Giving is limited to CA.

Adolph Coors Foundation
350-C Clayton St.
Denver, CO 80206
(303) 388-1636
Contact: Executive Manager

Education is one activity area emphasized by this foundation. Seed money is provided for special projects. Giving is mainly in CO.

The Hartford Courant Foundation, Inc.
285 Broad St.
Hartford, CT 06115
(203) 241-6472
Contact: Executive Director

Education is one of the main areas of concern to the foundation. Grant recipients receive seed money and technical assistance. Giving is limited to CT.

The New Haven Foundation
One State St.
New Haven, CT 06510
(203) 777-2386
Contact: Director

The New Haven Foundation makes available seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for special projects affecting educational institutions. Giving is limited to south central CT.

The Travelers Companies Foundation
One Tower Square
Hartford, CT 06183-1060
(203) 277-4764
Contact: Executive Director

Among its activities, the foundation funds programs in the Hartford,CT schools. Technical assistance is provided to grant recipients.

The Waterbury Foundation
P.O. Box 252
Waterbury, CT 06720
(203) 753-1315
Contact: Administrator

This foundation gives grants for education in the greater Waterbury,CT area, among other activities. The foundation provides seed money and consulting services for research.

Southeast Banking Corporation Foundation
One Southeast Financial Center
22nd Floor
Miami, FL 33131
(305) 375-7295
Contact: Executive Director

This foundation provides grants, primarily in FL, to education. Support given to grant recipients for special projects includes seed money, consulting services and technical assistance.

The Chicago Community Trust
222 North LaSalle St., Suite 1400
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 372-3356
Contact: Senior Staff Associate

Education is one area of activity for this organization. It seeks to encourage collaborative efforts in school reform, including labor relations and school restructuring. Grant recipients receive financial resources and technical assistance. Giving is limited to Cook County, IL.

The Albert Pick, Jr. Fund
30 North Michigan Ave., Suite 819
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 236-1192
Contact: Executive Director

Grants for education in the Chicago metropolitan area are one of the fund's activities. The fund provides consulting services and technical assistance for special projects.

Heritage Fund of Bartholomew County, Inc.
P.O. Box 1547
Columbus, IN 47202
(812) 376-7772
Contact: Executive Director

Grants for education-related projects, mainly in Bartholomew County, IN, are one of the activities of this fund. The fund makes seed money, consulting services and technical assistance available for research and special projects.

Community Foundation of the Greater Baltimore Area, Inc.
6 East Hamilton St.
Baltimore, MD 21202
(301) 332-4171
Contact: Executive Director

This foundation has an interest in pilot projects and proposals which increase organizational effectiveness and self-sufficiency. Almost a quarter of grants (23 percent) from the Community Foundation have been education related. One recent recipient was the Baltimore City Public Schools Research and Development Foundation. Giving is mainly in MD.

The Nathaniel and Elizabeth P. Stevens Foundation
P.O. Box 111
North Andover, MA 01845
(617) 688-7211
Contact: Administrator

This foundation gives to special projects in education in MA, especially in the greater Lawrence area. Seed money, consulting services and technical assistance are available for grant recipients.

The Fremont Area Foundation
108 South Stewart
Fremont, MI 49412
(616) 924-5350
Contact: Executive Director

Grants primarily in Newaygo County, MI, for education are one aspect of the activities undertaken by this foundation. The foundation provides seed money and consulting services.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation
400 North Ave.
Battle Creek, MI 49107-3398
(616) 968-1611
Contact: Program Director

Education is one field of activity that is of interest to the foundation. Grant recipients receive financial assistance. Giving is limited to MI.

The Simpson Foundation
c/o City Bank and Trust Company
One Jackson Square
Jackson, MI 49201
(517) 788-2780
Contact: Vice President and Trust Officer, City Bank and Trust Company

Among its activities, this foundation gives grants to Hillsdale County, MI, for educational purposes. Grant recipients receive seed money, consulting services, and technical assistance for special projects.

Norwin S. and Elizabeth N. Bean Foundation
c/o New Hampshire Charitable Fund
1 South St., P.O. Box 1335
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 225-6641
Contact: Associate Director

The Bean Foundation grants for education, limited to Amherst and Manchester, NH, are one area of activity of this foundation. It provides seed money and consulting services for special projects.

Cameron Baird Foundation
Box 564
Hamburg, NY 14075
(716) 992-9128
Contact: Jane D. Baird, Trustee

Secondary and higher education received 24 percent of grants in 1985. Giving is primarily in the Buffalo, NY area, and to a lesser extent in New York City.

The Buffalo Foundation
237 Main St.
Buffalo, NY 14203
(716) 852-2857
Contact: Director

This foundation administers trust funds, primarily in Erie County, N.Y., for educational institutions, among others. Grant recipients receive seed money, consulting services, and technical assistance for research and special projects.

Fund for the City of New York, Inc.
419 Park Ave., 16th Floor
New York, NY 10016
(212) 689-1240
Contact: Grants Administrator

Grants for public service productivity, limited to New York City, are one of the activities of this fund. The fund also operates an assistance program for public and nonprofit managers. Those receiving grants have the use of the foundation's consulting services for special projects.

Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, Inc.
101 Reynolda Village
Winston-Salem, NC 27106-5199
(919) 725-7541
Contact: Executive Director

Education is one area of activity for this foundation. It has been a main force in creating the Public School Forum of NC, which gives educators and parents the opportunity to engage in long-range planning for the state's public schools. The foundation provides financial support for grant recipients. Giving is limited to NC.

Iddings Foundation
Kettering Tower, Suite 1620
Dayton, OH 45423
(513) 224-1773
Contact: Administrative Secretary

Grants for elementary and secondary education in OH, especially in the Dayton area, are one area of activity covered by this foundation. It provides recipients with seed money and consulting services for special projects.

The Toledo Trust Foundation
c/o Toledo Trust Company
Three Seagate
Toledo, OH 43603
(419) 259-8217
Contact: Vice President, Toledo Trust Company

This foundation gives grants for secondary education, primarily in OH. Grant recipients receive consulting services and technical assistance.

The Leo Yassenoff Foundation
37 North High St., Suite 304
Columbus, OH 43215
(614) 221-4315
Contact: Executive Director

Grants for education in OH, especially Franklin County, are one activity for this foundation. It makes seed money, consulting services and technical assistance available for research and special projects.

The McMahon Foundation
P.O. Box 2156
Lawton, OK 73502
(405) 355-4622
Contact: Director

Over half (54 percent) of grants went to all levels of education in the fiscal year ending March 1985. Giving is limited to OK, with an emphasis on Lawton and Comanche Counties.

The Oregon Community Foundation
1110 Yeon Building
522 S.W. Fifth Ave.
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 227-6846
Contact: Executive Director

Two of the purposes of grants for education are to "promote the long-term ability to provide quality education" and "to demonstrate new ways to help students receive quality education." Giving is limited to nonprofit organizations in OR.

The 1957 Charity Trust
Mellon Bank (East)
Mellon Bank Center
Philadelphia, PA 19102
(215) 553-2517
Contact: Senior Trust Officer

Grants for education are one area of activity for this foundation. Grant recipients receive consulting services, seed money and technical assistance for research and special projects. Giving is mainly in PA, especially the Delaware Valley.

Amarillo Area Foundation
1000 Polk St.
P.O. Box 2569
Amarillo, TX 79105
(806) 376-4521
Contact: Executive Director

Grants are given for education, among other subject areas. The foundation provides seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for research and special projects. Grants go primarily to the 26 most northern counties of the TX Panhandle.

Communities Foundation of Texas, Inc.
4605 Live Oak St.
Dallas, TX 75204
(214) 826-5231
Contact: Executive Vice President

Education is one of the activities in which this foundation is involved. Grant recipients receive seed money, consulting services, and technical assistance for research and special projects. Giving is mainly in the Dallas, TX, area.

El Paso Community Foundation
Texas Commerce Bank Building
Suite 1616
El Paso, TX 79901
(915) 533-4020
Contact: Executive Director

Education is one area of activity for this foundation. Those with grants receive seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for research and special projects. Giving is limited to the El Paso, TX, area.

Meadows Foundation, Inc.
Wilson Historic Block
2922 Swiss Ave.
Dallas, TX 75204-5928
(214) 826-9431
Contact: Executive Vice President

Education is one field of interest to this foundation. It provides seed money, technical assistance and consulting services for research and special projects. Giving is limited to TX.

Spokane Inland Northwest Community Foundation
926 Paulsen Building
West 421 Riverside
Spokane, WA 99201-0402
(509) 624-2606
Contact: Executive Director

The foundation gives grants for education-related purposes, among its areas of interest. Those with grants receive seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for research and special projects. Giving is limited to the inland Northwest.

Greater Tacoma Community Foundation
P.O. Box 1121
Tacoma, WA 98401
(206) 383-5622
Contact: Associate Director

Grants from this foundation are for educational purposes, among others. Recipients receive consulting services, technical assistance and seed money. The foundation limits its giving to Pierce County, WA.

The Greater Kanawha Valley Foundation
P.O. Box 3041
Charleston, WV 25331
(304) 346-3620
Contact: Executive Director

Education is one of the activities supported by this foundation. The foundation provides seed money, consulting services and technical assistance for research and special projects. Grant giving is limited to the Greater Kanawha Valley, WV, area. ■

APPENDIX C
BIBLIOGRAPHY/RESOURCES

BOOKS AND REPORTS

American Arbitration Association. *Arbitration in the Schools.* New York, NY: 1986.

American Association of School Administrators. "Collective Bargaining." *Critical Issues.* Arlington, VA: 1981.

American Federation of Teachers. *School Restructuring Resource Kit.* Washington, DC: 1987.

Bagin, Don. *How to Start and Improve a P.R. Program.* Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association, 1975.

Brandt, Ronald S.(Ed.). "Restructuring Schools to Match a Changing Society." *Educational Leadership.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, February 1988.

Brodinsky, Ben. "Building Morale: Motivating Staff." *Critical Issues.* American Association of School Administrators, 1983.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. *Who Will Teach Our Children?* Sacramento, CA: 1985.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.* Washington, DC: May 1986.

Clinton, Bill. *Speaking of Leadership.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1987.

Cohen-Rosenthal, Edward, and Cynthia E. Burton. *Mutual Gains: A Guide to Union-Management Cooperation.* New York: Praeger, 1987.

Decker, Larry E., and Virginia Decker. *Home/School/Community Involvement.* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1988.

DeSchweinitz, Dorothea. *Labor and Management in a Common Enterprise.* Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1949.

Duncan, Robert C. *Involvement of Professional Personnel in Decision Making and Handling Complaints.* Frankfort, KY: Kentucky School Boards Association, 1987.

Education Commission of the States. *What Next? New Leverage for Teachers.* Denver, CO: 1986.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. *From Isolation to Collaboration: Improving the Work Environment of Teaching.* Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, July 1987.

Ferguson, Donald L. *A Design Process to Improve Public Relations with Your Community.* Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association, 1979.

Freedom, Karl. *Workplace Democracy and Productivity.* Washington, DC: National Center for Economic Alternatives, 1980.

Goodlad, John. *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Hawley, David. *Quality Circles.* Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, September 1984.

The Holmes Group. *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group.* E. Lansing, MI: April 1986.

Israel, Gary, Dutch Klevwegt, and Harold Clinton. *Quality Circles in Education.* Des Moines, IA: Des Moines Area Community College, 1986.

Lawton, Dorothy. *Collaborative Bargaining in Schools: Case Studies and Recommendations.* Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, September 1987.

Mathews, Carl E. *One School at a Time: School Based Management: A Process for Change.* Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1985.

McDonnell, Lorraine M., and Anthony Pascal. *Teacher Unions and Educational Reform.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1988.

Metropolitan Life and Affiliated Companies. *The American Teacher 1986: Restructuring the Teaching Profession.* New York, NY: April-June 1986.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. *Effective Teachers: Effective Evaluation in America's Elementary and Middle Schools.* Alexandria, VA: 1988.

National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association. *Ventures in Good Schooling: A Cooperative Model for a Successful School.* Reston, VA: August 1986.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Education Reform.* Washington, DC: 1983.

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. *Leaders for America's Schools.* Washington, DC: March 1987.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers. *Looking in on Your School: A Workbook for Improving Public Education.* Chicago, IL: 1982.

National Education Association. "Employee Participation Programs: Considerations for the School Site." *Studies in Collective Bargaining.* Washington, DC: 1980.

National Education Association. *An Open Letter to American Schools, Students and Tomorrow.* Washington, DC: 1987.

National Education Association. *Teachers for Tomorrow*. Washington, DC: July 1987.

National Education Association and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. *What is Ventures in Good Schooling?* Washington, DC: May 1987.

National Governors' Association. *Time for Results: The Governor's 1991 Report on Education*. Washington, DC: August 1986.

National School Boards Association. *A National Imperative: Educating for the 21st Century*. Alexandria, VA: 1988.

National School Boards Association. *Rewarding Excellence: Teacher Compensation and Incentive Plans*. Alexandria, VA: September 1987.

National School Boards Association. *Good Teachers: An Unblinking Look at Supply and Preparation*. Alexandria, VA: May 1987.

National School Boards Association. *America's School Boards: The Positive Force*. Alexandria, VA: 1987.

National School Boards Association. *Report on Public Education*. Alexandria, VA: 1986.

National School Boards Association. *Becoming a Better Board Member*. Alexandria, VA: 1982.

National School Boards Association. *School/Community Communication: Research Report*. Alexandria, VA: 1980.

National School Boards Association. *State Statutes on School Districts Collective Bargaining*. Alexandria, VA: 1987.

National School Public Relations Association. *School/Community Communications: Tips and Techniques*. Arlington, VA: 1987.

National School Public Relations Association. *Building Public Confidence in Your Schools*. Arlington, VA: 1979.

National School Public Relations Association. *Building Good PR Programs*. Arlington, VA: 1980.

National School Public Relations Association. *Managing Your Schools: What's Ahead*. Arlington, VA: 1979.

National School Public Relations Association. *New Parents and Schools: Creating a New Team*. Arlington, VA: 1982.

National School Public Relations Association. *School Labor Strife: Re-building the Team*. Arlington, VA: 1982.

National School Public Relations Association. *Staff Recognition: Unlocking the Potential for Success*. Arlington, VA: 1987.

Patterson, James L. *Productive School Systems for a Nonrational World*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1986.

Pheasant, Marilyn. *Theory Z Bargaining Styles: Teachers and Administrators in Two School Districts, Report Dealing with Trust*. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, September 1987.

Public Education Information Network. *Education for a Democratic Future: Equity and Excellence Issues in an Age of Accelerating School Reform*. St. Louis, MO: 1985.

Rossow, Joseph F. *Communications Handbook for School Board Members*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association, 1977.

Rusk, Candace J. "Creating a School Environment Supportive of the Principal's Role as Instructional Leader." Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, December 1986.

Schmuck, Richard A., and Philip J. Runkel. *Handbook of Organization Development in Schools*. Third edition. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1985.

Sizer, Theodore R. *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1984.

Smith, Stuart C. "New Structures Build Collaboration among Teachers and Administrators." Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, Fall 1986.

Sweeney, Jim. *Tips for Improving School Climate*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, 1988.

U.S. Department of Labor. *Resource Guide to Labor-Management Cooperation*. Washington, DC: 1983.

U.S. Department of Labor. *New Directions for Labor and Management*. Washington, DC: 1988.

ARTICLES

Shorthouse, James. "Use Staff Chats To Build Your School's Team Spirit." *Executive Educator* October 1986.

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. "Worker Participation in the Public Sector." *Labor-Management Cooperation*. U.S. Department of Labor, 1984.

Baker, Keith. "Can We Afford Mediocre Quality of Education?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1988.

Benton, Sam. "Educating for Democracy: Raising Expectations." *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1988.

Bird, Tom, and Judith Warren Little. "How Schools Organize the Teaching Occupation." *Elementary School Journal*, March 1986.

Boston, Bill, and John Lloyd. "Collective Bargaining: The Proposal to Implement a New Solidarity Compact." *Executive Educator*, June 1987.

Bayne, John J. "A Superintendent's Place Is at the Bargaining Table." *Executive Education*, August 1987.

Calkins, Kenneth L. "Employee Suggestions Lift Staff Morale." *Executive Educator*, October 1986.

Carnes Lottie, Jill. "Expanding the Teacher's Role: Hammond's School Improvement Process." *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1988.

Cole, James E. "If You Should Promote the Management Team, You Must Pitch In and Do Your Part." *Executive Educator*, July 1985.

Cox, Marquerite V., and Robert C. Stevens. "How's Why We No Longer Dread Contract Negotiations." *American School Board Journal*, February 1988.

Creedon, John J. "We're Listening to Teachers—Won't You?" *Executive Educator*, March 1986.

Cross, Part II. "Win-Win: Effective Schools and Reform: An Agenda for the 1990s." *Government Union Review*, Winter 1987.

Cross, Part II, and Joseph M. Cianciolo. "Collective Bargaining and Multiple Control Gains in Education." *Government Union Review*, Spring 1986.

Cuomo, David L., and James E. Ferguson. "Our Priority-Setting Plan Is Worth the Straight-A Grade." *Executive Educator*, April 1987.

Dumas, Stanislaw S. "Collective Negotiations in Education and the Public Interest: A Proposed Method of Impasse Management Perspective." *Journal of Law and Education*, July 1987.

Dun Pamphlet. "Effective Collaborative Administration: Concept and Practice." *Kappa Review*, September 1986.

DuCommun, William, and Ken Micheletti. "Joint Committees Take the Rancor out of Bargaining with Our Teachers." *American School Board Journal*, October 1985.

Fashion, Ellen, and Kathleen McCormick. "Repeated Attacks on Education: Put Limits on the Demands." *American School Board Journal*, October 1985.

Foster, Joe B. "Work Is Changing and So Should Schools." *Executive Educator*, September 1984.

Gaskamp, Mary. "Negotiations." *American School and University*, September 1985.

Hammond-Matthews, James, and Helene Mills. "Create the Proper Atmosphere to Brighten Your School Climate." *Executive Educator*, May 1987.

Herman, Jerry J. "With Collaborative Bargaining, You Work with the Union—Not Against It." *American School Board Journal*, October 1985.

Hornick, Neal Q. "Is the Time Finally Ripe for Educational Democracy?" *Social Policy*, Fall 1985.

Holcomb, John. "When Faculty *Feel* Spurned, Here's How to Rekindle Enthusiasm among Teachers." *American School Board Journal*, March 1985.

Howe, Jonathan J. "Seeking Alternatives to Collective Bargaining." *Education Week*, October 23, 1987.

Howe, Jonathan J. "School Boards Often Sought to Follow Authors." *School Board News*, August 5, 1987.

Huber, Joe, and Jo Thomas. "Focus: Three Guiding Lights, and Emerge from the Bargaining Fog." *American School Board Journal*, March 1987.

Hummel, David. "Improving Education Through Quality Circles." *Contemporary Education*, Spring 1987.

Johnson, Gladys Styles, and Vito Germinaro. "Relationships between Teacher Dependency Status and Loyalty." *Journal of Educational Administration*, Winter 1987.

Knoop, Robert. "Should You Delegate? Or Invite Participation?" *Education Canada*, Fall 1987.

LaPlant, James C. "Collegial Support for Professional Development and School Improvement." *Theory Into Practice*, Summer 1986.

Leib, Kenneth, and Jeannette Stein. "Our Board Teacher Can Together, Believe Tension and Produce Results." *American School Board Journal*, February 1986.

Lilton, Fred B. "Another Look At Win-Win." *Bulletin*, National Association of Educational Negotiators, June 1985.

Lilton, Dennis, and Bobby Ford. "The Challenge to Make Good Schools Great." *NEA Today*, January 1988.

Lucas, Jane. "Dade County Teachers Value Making School Decisions." *Education Week*, January 27, 1988.

Mancuso, Gene J. "A Blueprint for Empowering Teachers." *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1988.

Martin, David. "Will the Dawn of Cooperative Employment Rank Your Workers' Eyes?" *American School Board Journal*, July 1984.

Matula, Joseph J. "Learn to Lead by Strolling Around." *Executive Educator*, July 1984.

McKeon, Barbara. "Invite Inside Teacher Burning Eyes." *Executive Educator*, September 1986.

McKeon, Jamieson A. "Discover the New World of Creative School Management." *Executive Educator*, December 1984.

McNeil, Linda M. "Contradictions of Control, Part 1: Administrators and Teachers." *Phi Delta Kappan*, January, 1988.

McNeil, Linda M. "Contradictions of Control, Part 2: Teachers, Students and Curriculum." *Phi Delta Kappan*, February 1988.

McNeil, Linda M. "Contradictions of Control, Part 3: Contradictions of Reform." *Phi Delta Kappan*, March 1988.

Mitchell, Douglas E. "A New Approach to Collective Bargaining." *Policy Briefs*, Winter 1986.

Nemit, Chuck, and Larry Swift. "Prescription for Labor Pains: Combine Bargaining with Problem Solving." *American School Board Journal*, July 1987.

Nemit, Chuck. "The Union Has a Communications Strategy — and Your Board Should, Too." *American School Board Journal*, October 1986.

Nesbit, George W. "What's Missing from the National Agenda for School Reform? Teacher Professionalism and Local Initiative." *Urban Review*, Vol. 19 No. 1, 1986.

Nyland, Larry. "How We Moved from a Bitter Strike to Better Schools." *Executive Educator*, April 1984.

Nyland, Larry. "Win-Win Bargaining Takes Perseverance." *Executive Educator*, February 1987.

Olson, Lynn. "Children Unmask Hate." *Education Week*, January 27, 1988.

O'Rourke, Patrick. "Shared Decision Making at the School Site: Moving Toward a Professional Model." *American Educator*, Spring 1987.

Pellicer, Leonard O., and Kenneth R. Stevenson. "Bypass the Cooks, Stitch the Broth." *Executive Educator*, April 1987.

Pennella, Michael, and Stephen Philips. "Help Your Board Negotiate: Stay off the Bargaining Team." *Executive Educator*, April 1987.

Shanker, Albert. "Our Profession, Our Schools: The Case for Fundamental Reform." *American Educator*, Fall 1986.

Shanker, Albert. "The Making of a Profession." *American Educator*, Fall 1985.

Shannon, Thomas A. "The Buzzwords of Educational Reform Rhetoric." *School Board News*, August 15, 1987.

Shannon, Thomas A. "Maintaining the Momentum of Improvement." *School Board News*, June 10, 1987.

Shannon, Thomas A. "Adopt a Public Relations Plan." *American School Board Journal*, July 1984.

Shannon, Thomas A. "Keep Schools a Top Public Priority." *American School Board Journal*, February 1984.

Shannon, Thomas A. "A New Approach to School District Communications." *School Board News*, March 2, 1988.

Sickler, Joan L. "Teachers in Charge: Empowering the Professionals." *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1988.

Smith, Patricia and Russell Baker. "An Alternative Form of Collective Bargaining." *Phi Delta Kappan*, April 1986.

Snyder, John M. "What's on Teachers' Minds? This New Principal Found Out." *Executive Educator*, August 1987.

Strech, William H. "We Peg Teachers' Incentive Pay to Student Performance." *Executive Educator*, March 1987.

Tillerson, Kathryn M. "Building Level Staff Development: A Personal Account of a Peer Helping Peers." *Journal of Staff Development*, Spring 1987.

Urbanski, Adam. "Restructuring the Teaching Profession." *Education Week*, October 28, 1987.

Weintraub, Robert J. "Meaningful Participation and an Effective School: Students, Parents and Teachers Run Their Own Micro-Society." *Equity and Choice*, Fall 1984.

Welsh, Patrick. "Are Administrators Ready to Share Decision Making with Teachers?." *American Educator*, Spring 1987.

Wise, Arthur E. "Legislated Learning Revisited." *Phi Delta Kappan*, January 1988.

Woodbury, Stephen A. "The Scope of Bargaining and Bargaining Outcomes in the Public Schools." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, January 1985.

Yeble, Lawrence C. "A Pro-Management Plan Can Help Keep Employees Loyal and Happy." *American School Board Journal*, March 1980.

Zakariya, Sally Banks. "How Carnegie and the Unions Would Transform Your Schools." *Executive Educator*, September 1986.

FILMS TAPES

American Federation of Teachers, "Focus on Education Reform in Rochester."

American Federation of Teachers, "The Nation's First Merit School Incentive Program." (Dade County).

American Federation of Teachers, "Toledo."

National Education Association, "Mastery In Learning: Schools For Tomorrow."

NSBA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT
Leonard Rovins*

PRESIDENT-ELECT
James R. Oglesby*

VICE PRESIDENT
Martha C. Fricke*

SECRETARY-TREASURER
Joyce W. Rogers*

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
Jonathan T. Howe*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Thomas A. Shannon**
ex officio

DIRECTORS

Richard J. Anderson
E. Harold Fisher*
Madeline M. Blue
Don Hunsaker, II
Boyd W. Boehlje
Harriet C. Jelinek
Jerry D. Bryan
Bernard Kershtein
Mary E. Busch
Martha A. Miller
Rubye S. Dobbins
Arlene R. Penfield
Janet E. Durig
William M. Soult
JoAnn S. Wimmer*

EX OFFICIO

Jonathan C. Wilson, Chairman, Council of Urban Boards of Education
Bob Mooneyham***, Chairman, Federation Member Executive Directors' NSBA Liaison Committee
David M. Pedersen, Chairman, Council of School Attorneys

ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

James Betchkal
Don E. Blom
Michael E. Eader
Jeremiah Floyd
Susan P. Merry
Michael A. Resnick
August W. Steinhilber

CENTER FOR FEDERATION MEMBER RELATIONS, STATE LEGISLATION & PUBLIC POLICY

Michael E. Eader, Associate Executive Director
Marthatone F. Lafley, Assistant Executive Director
Adria L. Thomas, Director, Research and Information Services
Eve Shepard, Manager, Information Services
Bill Tanner, Information Coordinator, Information Services

NSBA SPECIAL RESOURCE TASK FORCE

John M. Brandt, Deputy Executive Vice President, Ohio School Boards Association
Kenneth Cole, Assistant Executive Director, Wisconsin Association of School Boards
Harvey F. Finck, Director, Management Services, Pennsylvania School Boards Association
Marcus Johnston, Director, Labor Relations Service, Florida School Boards Association
Charles Nannt, Director of Management Information & Training, Washington State School Boards Association
Robert J. Rader, Director of Policy Services, New York State School Boards Association

* Executive Committee
** Executive Committee Member ex officio
*** Attends Executive Committee meetings as a non-voting observer

about NSBA . . .

The National School Boards Association is located in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area in colonial Alexandria, Virginia. NSBA is a not-for-profit organization whose primary mission is the general advancement of education through the unique North American tradition of local citizen control. In this way, public elementary and secondary school policy is decided by the nation's 97,000 local school board members, who are accountable to the community either directly (97% are elected) or indirectly through appointment by elected officials. NSBA promotes the betterment of the public elementary and secondary schools through services to state school boards associations and more than 15,300 local school boards; by maintaining liaison with other education organizations and governmental authorities; and by increasing school board impact on federal education laws and regulations.

Federation Members of NSBA are the 49 state school boards assocations, the Hawaii State Board of Education, plus the boards of education in the District of Columbia and the U.S. Virgin Islands. About 2,000 local district school boards, which are members in good standing of their state associations, are NSBA Direct Affiliates.

NSBA represents the interests of school boards before Congress; provides development programs for school board members; provides school district management services; and offers to the school board movement a variety of other services, including an annual convention.

The NSBA Federal Relations Network, composed of up to three school board members in each congressional district, plays a major role in NSBA's education advocacy program in Washington, D.C.

The award-winning monthly magazine, **The American School Board Journal,** has been owned and published by NSBA since 1967. Publication of another monthly magazine, **The Executive Educator,** began in 1979, and a fortnightly newspaper, **School Board News,** began in 1981.

Seven component groups within the Federation play a significant role in National School Boards Association activities to serve Federation Members and school board needs:

- The Council of Urban Boards of Education serves the special needs of urban school boards.
- The Large District Forum focuses on the needs of major non-urban school districts.
- The Rural District Forum serves the special needs of rural school board leaders.
- The Council of School Attorneys focuses on issues of school law.
- The Federation Member Executive Directors' NSBA Liaison Committee serves as a forum for top staff administrators of the state associations and NSBA.
- The Conference of School Boards Association Communicators is composed of Federation Member and NSBA communications professionals.
- The Federal Policy Coordinators' Network focuses on administration of federally funded programs.

NSBA also maintains close liaison with other groups, including the National Caucus of Black School Board Members, National Caucus of Hispanic School Board Members, National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), American Association of School Administrators (AASA), National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), and Education Commission of the States (ECS), to mention but a few nationwide organizations influencing education in the U.S.

NSBA policy is determined by a 150-member Delegate Assembly composed of active school board members from across the country. Translating this policy into action programs is a Board of Directors consisting of 21 members and three ex-officio members. The executive director administers NSBA programs, assisted by a professional staff.

NSBA

National School Boards Association
1680 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 838-6722

69